Treading the (corporate) board:

A critical analysis of organisational diversity discourse

Alison Clarke

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Management Studies

Essex Business School

University of Essex

May 2020

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF IMAGES AND PHOTOGRAPHS

Declaration

This thesis is a presentation of my own original research. Wherever contributions of others are included, every effort has been made to indicate this clearly by making reference to the literature.

Acknowledgements

My first thanks obviously have to go to my endlessly patient and supportive supervisors – Professor Melissa Tyler and Professor Martyna Śliwa - who have stayed with me every step of the way. It's hard to express my gratitude for all the guidance, advice and help you have offered me over the last four years. It's going to be strange not having a series of deadlines after which I wait anxiously for the comments to come back. I fear my life will be quite empty!

In a different capacity altogether I'd like to thank my son, Aaron and his wife Catherine, for showing a real and genuine interest in my topic. Our conversations were always fascinating in terms of your insights and contributions.

Last, but not least of course, I would like to thank my partner Richard who has not only been there for me throughout the last four years but also during the previous two when I was doing my part-time Masters. I'm not sure I would still be here if it wasn't for him doing all the shopping and all the cooking, keeping body and soul together. Apart from his practical support, he also listened to me endlessly going through my conference presentations offering his thoughts about what I was saying and how I was saying it. I suspect he knows rather more about Adorno now that he ever thought (or maybe wanted) to know. Thank you. I really do appreciate all you did.

Abstract

My aims in this thesis, in terms of analysing the persistence of gendered occupational segmentation in the UK, are three-fold. The first is to explore the extent to which organisational diversity discourse is the outcome of essentialist, binary thinking; the second is to examine whether essentialism can be analysed as a form of identity thinking; and the third is to assess whether and in what ways that analysis can contribute to feminist organisation studies and critical diversity scholarship. To achieve those aims, I carried out a critical discourse analysis of the diversity discourse of 30 FTSE 100 companies, highlighting the essentialism that underpins it, and the ways in which organisations have conflated biological and cultural essentialism. By drawing on Theodor Adorno's theory of negative dialectics, I argue that this essentialism can be analysed and understood in terms of the identity thinking that permeates organisational discourse such that women are classified and categorised according to their supposed natural, biological characteristics. However, as organisations have mistaken the natural for the cultural and the cultural for the natural, they have come to assume that the object of women's biology (the body or the natural) equates to the concept of their sexed and gendered characteristics (the social or the cultural). Adorno, on the other hand, argues that under non-identity thinking, "objects do not go into their concepts without leaving a remainder" (Adorno, 1973: 5). I suggest that Adorno's theory contributes to feminist scholarship by shifting the focus away from the binary thinking inherent within the sex/gender dualism and onto the identity thinking that produced it in the first place. I contribute to critical diversity and feminist organisation studies scholarship by moving away from an analysis of corporate diversity discourse focused largely on difference,

inclusion and poststructuralism respectively to an analysis highlighting its identarian, subjectivistic and hierarchical nature.

INTRODUCTION

Somewhat unusually perhaps, I start this thesis by briefly explaining what it is not about before setting out its focus, rationale and theoretical underpinning. The reason is that, as a piece of research about gendered occupational segmentation in the UK, I want to clarify early on where I have drawn certain boundaries. Firstly, therefore, it is not a work of philosophy although it draws heavily on theoretical ideas. Secondly, it is not a feminist analysis per se, although much of it is predicated on critical, feminist theory. Finally it is not a practical treatise that provides suggestions for managers about how to address gender inequality more effectively. Rather, it is a philosophically informed critique of corporate diversity discourse, located within feminist organisation studies, based on the ontological premise that gendered occupational segmentation in the UK is driven by essentialism, which is underpinned by identity thinking.

This phenomenon manifests itself in two main ways. The first is horizontally, which is when women are disproportionately concentrated in particular, low-paid sectors of the economy; and the second is vertically when they are under-represented in high-status jobs and over-represented in lower status work (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2017). Both types of segmentation contribute to gender inequality by concentrating women predominantly into the lowest ranks of a narrow, poorly-paid range of sectors (Brynin and Perales, 2016; Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2017; Perales, 2013). Although I address vertical segmentation in terms of highlighting the under-representation of women on corporate boards and in senior management to some extent, this focus is very much a springboard (a hook, if you will) from which to discuss segmentation more generally, for instance in relation to the gender pay gap and the low valuation

attached to women's work, in order to answer the central research question. That is, why inequality in the form of gendered occupational segmentation has persisted in the UK despite the enactment of equal pay and sex discrimination legislation almost half a century ago and the introduction of corporate equality discourse over three decades ago. Although things have improved over that time – particularly in relation to the number of women on corporate boards – gendered occupational segmentation in the UK remains highly defined.

There are no shortage of labour market explanations to account for this phenomenon, ranging from Marxist (Engels, 1972) and human capital theories (Becker, 1964), focusing mainly on structural relationships within the labour market; to patriarchy theories (Hartmann, 1976; Hartmann and Markusen, 1980) focusing mainly on issues of gender (Wharton, 1991). As many of these theories assumed that markets are gender neutral, it fell to feminist sociologists and organisation studies scholars to analyse, in the first instance, the specific implications for women of the separation of the public from the private sphere which developed over the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Hawkesworth, 2006; Pateman, 1989; Walby, 1990), and subsequently the effects of industrialisation. Although women started to enter the labour market in significant numbers in the twentieth century, this notion of a natural separation of spheres weakened their position not only because of a belief that women should not be paid the same as men, but that it was natural for women to predominate in sectors such as the caring, cleaning and service industries as these reflected their historically developed domestic skills (Abbott et al., 2005; Pateman, 1989). In other words, gendered work patterns and unequal pay became rationalised on the basis that they reflected the biological role of women as actual or potential mothers (Abbott et al., 2005).

In this way, labour market theories tend to overlook the constraints imposed on individual actors, particularly women (Wharton, 1991), and instead focus on the role of the individuals themselves. For instance, Hakim (2000) attributes women's position in the labour market to the choices that women themselves make at an individual level. These include preferring to work part time and taking career breaks after having children (Hakim, 2000). Although feminist critics acknowledge that individuals and groups make choices, they also argue that they are made within labour market structures that are based on an assumption of organisational gender neutrality (Acker, 1990). As such they fail to recognise the impact that gendered structures and processes have on women such that they may be constrained and/or compelled to work differently from the "ideal worker" (Benschop and Van den Brink, 2018: 2; Cha, 2013: 161). That is, someone who is not disrupted by non-work demands.

A good example of a behaviour which appears gender-neutral, but which rests on a dominant ideology that is itself highly gendered is the tendency for men to work longer hours than women (Simpson, 1998). As those who work long hours are not just seen as being more productive, but also more committed to their jobs, it follows that those who fail to work long hours or who work part time are perceived as being less committed to their careers (Cha, 2013; Cha and Weeden, 2014). In a workplace that values overwork, women are therefore more likely to be evaluated poorly, less likely to receive opportunities for promotion and more likely to leave, thereby facilitating the concept of the male breadwinner as the normative ideal of masculinity (Cha, 2013). The combination of motherhood and part-time working is regarded by many employers as being particularly incompatible with senior positions. As a result, professional mothers who work part time often sacrifice their

hope of career advancement and instead prepare themselves for stepping onto the "mommy track" (Gatrell, 2008: 129).

The danger is that when there are gender inequalities within the system which are not acknowledged, it can lead to an assumption that it is the women who need to be fixed as opposed to the structural barriers standing in their way. In other words, it is because women, as a group, do not have the "right credentials" (Gov.uk, 2018: webpage) that they are disproportionately over-represented in lower status work or within low-paid sectors of the economy. My analysis suggests that, underpinning this assumption is an understanding that women are a specific natural grouping who share certain characteristics - such as being kind, sensitive and concerned about others - loosely defined within corporate discourse as "female talent" (Davies, 2015: 18) and "women's skills" (Hampton-Alexander Review, 2016: 10). It follows that men also constitute a specific category, but with a different set of essential characteristics which include being aggressive, forceful, and decisive (Gipson et al., 2017; Heilman, 2001; Stoker et al., 2012). It is this pervasive concept of essentialism within corporate discourse – that women and men have certain sexed and gendered characteristics – that is the focus of my critical analysis into the persistence of women's inequality in the UK labour market.

The concept of essentialism does not just underpin the phenomenon of gendered occupational segmentation, however. Rather its significance is much more profound in that it also provides the fundamental building block to a question that women's rights advocates have been asking since at least the eighteenth century (Calás and Smircich, 2014; Pringle and Strachan, 2015). In addition, it was the central question posed by de Beauvoir in *The Second Sex*: "What is a woman?" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 5). Indeed, it is a question that has remained central to feminism

ever since, although it has been addressed in different ways. For instance, second wave feminists in the late 1960s and early 1970s developed a clear distinction between what they termed biological sex and the socially constructed genders of masculinity and femininity (Rubin, 1975) on the basis that the sex/gender divide was "a construct of culture rather than a given of nature" (Ortner, 1972: 28). Butler (1990a, 1993), on the other hand, argued that the category of sex, as a regulatory ideal, was just as culturally constructed as gender. Although there is a body, she posits that we have to access it through concepts since we cannot separate it from the acts that constitute it (Butler, 1993). In other words, as the act of performing constitutes who we are, there cannot be a subject that exists prior to the body coming into existence because by conceding some version of it, we simultaneously contribute to its formation (Butler, 1993).

These different approaches to the sex and gender constructs that underpin essentialism have also been played out at a theoretical level within feminist organisation studies, as discussed in Chapter Two. For instance, early mainstream "women in management" scholars emphasised the binary notion that because women and men are naturally different they also have different, essential, skills (Eagly and Johnson, 1990; Rosener, 1990; Vinnicombe, 1987). Although critical management and organisation studies scholars drew on Adorno to develop a critical analysis of organisations, they failed to engage with his critique of identity thinking in relation to gender within organisations. Likewise, although feminist organisation studies scholars developed critical analyses of organisations, they tended to draw on poststructuralist theory and the ways in which discourses structure gendered organisational subjectivities (Calás and Smircich, 1996; Calás and Smircich, 2006;

Calás et al., 2014). By drawing on Adorno's critique to analyse the role of gender in organisations, I aim to revitalise the connection between these disciplines.

For their part, critical diversity scholars contest the belief that things or people have certain essential properties (Dzubinski and Diehl, 2018; Ghorashi and Sabelis, 2013; Lorbiecki and Jack, 2000; Muhr, 2011). Instead they emphasise the contradictory tendency of organisations whereby they mobilise a discourse of individual difference, whilst continuing to operationalise an ethos of group-based, essentialist disadvantage (Johns and Green, 2009; Mease and Collins, 2018; Ozbilgin and Tatli, 2011). Feminists and diversity scholars have also promoted the notion of disrupting categories or going beyond the binary (Darwin, 2017; Linstead and Pullen, 2006). This has been done, for instance, by expanding the concepts of gender and woman to include "something that wasn't included in it before" (Bettcher, 2013: 244); by "thinking in terms of multiplicity" or "excess" (Muhr, 2011: 349; Priola et al., 2018); by challenging the dominance of hetero/cisnormative discourses within organisations (Rumens, 2017); or by understanding men and women in terms of their "becoming" (Deleuze and Guattari, 2003: 275; Pullen and Rhodes, 2015). Likewise, binary gender roles are increasingly being challenged within the media, popular culture and, to some extent, equality law within the UK as discussed in Chapter One. Despite these shifts in academic and societal discourse, however, corporate discourse remains tied to an essentialist, hierarchical epistemology in which women are portrayed as having certain, fixed innate qualities which, in turn, perpetuates occupational and labour market segmentation.

In order to explore this phenomenon, I carried out a Foucauldian analysis of the text and images within the annual reports and website diversity pages of the top 15 and bottom 15 FTSE 100 companies (see Appendix One), as listed within the

2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report (Cranfield University School of Management, 2016). This report ranks all FTSE 100 companies, representing the top 100 public companies in the UK (London Stock Exchange, Undated), in order of the number of women directors on their boards. This secondary research is supplemented by government reports as well as a number of newspaper articles. In order to discuss and analyse the findings, I draw on Foucault's understanding of discourses as "practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak" (Foucault, 1972: 49). Not only does his approach emphasise the mutually constitutive relationship between discourse and objects, his understanding of subjectivity enabled me to identify the contradictory ways in which women are portrayed as both perfect and imperfect subjects, as explained in Chapter Five.

My analysis suggests, inter alia, that corporate diversity discourse is trapped within a binary ontology, reflecting the ways in which gendered occupational segmentation is (and has historically been) researched and analysed (Bielby and Baron, 1986; Eurofound, 2017; Perales, 2013; Walby, 1988). As a result, feminists have to operate and think "within the very dichotomizing" that they are criticising (Harding, 1986: 662), a paradox which I also face in relation to the shifting meanings of sex and gender. This is not to say that it is always disadvantageous for feminists to retain dualism, not least because it is necessary in order to analyse and challenge gendered occupational segmentation. Rather the question is how to draw on duality as a tool, whilst at the same time challenging its underlying ontology. In order to address these issues and to better understand the persistence of essentialism within corporate discourse, I suggest we need a critical analysis that offers not just a normative lens challenging the binary thinking that underpins it, but also one which

shifts the debate away from an historical focus on conceptual thought and onto the categorical thinking that produced it in the first place.

In order to fulfil those criteria, I draw on theoretical insights and ideas derived from the critique of identity thinking and the theory of negative dialectics developed by the German philosopher Theodor Adorno. As identity thinking is a normal cognitive function whereby people classify and categorise objects under concepts in order to make sense of the world, Adorno argues that it is also an inevitable form of thinking (Adorno, 1973). As such, identity thinking "says what something comes under, what it exemplifies or represents, and what, accordingly, it is not itself" (Adorno, 1973: 149). The problem, however, is that because identity thinking is concerned with categorising objects under concepts, it does not say what the object is but rather what it exemplifies in terms of the overarching concept under which it has been classified. In addition, because identity thinking assumes we can know an object once all possible classifications of it have been made, it also assumes that the object has all the properties of its concept. This misrepresentation is compounded by a tendency within identity thinking to understate the complexity of objects by burying the particular under the universal (Adorno, 1973). Although he accepts that it is not intrinsically irrational for humans to engage in identity thinking, Adorno is critical of the hierarchical subjectivistic thinking that it produces (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2002).

Instead he argues that the "secret telos" of thinking should be dialectical or non-identity thought which "seeks to say what something is" as opposed to the concept that it "comes under" (Adorno, 1973: 149), allowing us to account for the individuality of particular phenomena (Neimark and Tinker, 1987). So rather than subsuming the object under its high-level concept, non-identity thinking

acknowledges that each individual object has "definitions not contained in the definition of the class" (Adorno, 1973: 150). It is in this way that we can see that "objects do not go into their concepts without leaving a remainder" (Adorno, 1973: 5). Adorno accepts therefore that objects fall under concepts but argues that each object is also unique and it is that unique, particular quality that constitutes its non-identical aspect (Stone, 2008). As such, he posits that objects should have priority, not conceptual thought (Adorno, 1973).

This dialectical approach is important, interesting and timely because it offers a non-conceptual, non-identitarian way of analysing the constructs of sex and gender as well as the relationship between those constructs and the object of the body. It does this in four main ways. Firstly, by emphasising the priority of the object, Adorno draws attention to some of the dangers within conceptual thought whereby the object is confused with the concept. Rather than focusing solely on concepts such as sex and gender, therefore, Adorno tells us to also bear in mind the object of the analysis (the body) and the ways in which the object and the concept interact to produce a remainder. It follows, therefore, that the object of the body must add up to more than the concepts of sex and gender. In relation to gendered occupational segmentation, the bodies of women must therefore add up to more than their sexed and gendered characteristics. As essentialism is a classic example of the assumption that the object has all the properties of the concept, Adorno's critique offers a new way to approach and understand it. Secondly, Adorno can help to make sense of the tendency of organisations to use the terms sex and gender interchangeably in their diversity discourse whilst at the same time conflating women's so-called natural qualities as members of a group with their unique characteristics through his insight that the concept of second nature (gender) has

become so reified that it is now mistaken for the object of first nature (the body). Thirdly, his dialectical approach can help to shift the current focus of the sex/gender debate away from the notion of going *beyond the binary* and towards a more critical approach exploring the identity thinking which lies *behind the binary*. Fourthly, because it acknowledges the inevitable impetus of people to classify and categorise, Adorno's critique of identity thinking accounts for the binary framework within which gendered occupational segmentation is historically researched and analysed and within which organisational discourse is framed. As sex is the most readily observed human trait, it is also the most pervasive method of categorising people (Carothers and Reis, 2013) into the two sexes of male and female, a process which involves identity actually being forced onto the object (Adorno, 1973). Although he acknowledges that identity thinking is therefore inevitable, Adorno suggests that by becoming more critically reflexive we can become more conscious of the degree to which we engage in binary thought. Once aware of this tendency, it then becomes possible to focus on the actual process by which we think in binary or identitarian terms, allowing us to engage more in non-identity (non-binary) thinking. I acknowledge that feminist organisation studies scholars have also focused on breaking down dichotomies, but within the context of poststructuralism and the primacy of discourse, as explained in more detail in Chapters Two and Three. As such they have overlooked the ways in which Adorno's critique can help to explain the gendered dynamics of organisational structures, an oversight which this thesis rectifies.

Likewise, feminist critical theory has, for many decades, contributed significant time and effort to analysing essentialism and binary thinking much of which dovetails with Adorno's critique and which is discussed in Chapter Three

(Butler, 1990a; Butler, 1993; de Beauvoir, 2011; Irigaray, 1985). For instance, it complements his emphasis on the inevitability of categorical thinking and his understanding of the "remainder" in terms of his theory of negative dialectics (Adorno, 1973: 5). However, by shifting the focus away from binary thinking and onto the identity thinking that lies behind it, Adorno's approach encourages an analysis that goes behind the binary rather than beyond it, as mentioned above.

Although there are differences between the theoretical approaches of Foucault and Adorno, in particular with regard to power relations within institutions, the similarities between them are just as significant. Indeed, both are highly sceptical of a dominant subject and the concept of a continuous history. However, although Foucault's emphasis on discourse complements Adorno's critique of identity thinking, there are important differences between the two theorists particularly with regard to their analysis of the subject-object relationship. In Chapter Four, therefore, I justify drawing on Foucault's understanding of discourse in order to identify and discuss the different discourses within my empirical data in Chapter Five; whilst relying on the concepts expounded in Adorno's negative dialectics in order to immanently explain and analyse the data in Chapter Six. In other words, Foucault's approach provides a discursive analysis with which to make sense of the data, with a particular focus on the concepts of power and subjectivity; while Adorno's immanent critique focuses on the subject-object relationship and the remainder that is left over.

In order to examine the issues identified above in more detail, the thesis tries to answer the following research questions:

1. Why does gender inequality in the form of gendered occupational segmentation continue to persist in the UK?

2. What are the discursive forms through which organisations articulate their commitment to greater gender equality on their websites and in their annual reports?

3. What insights can be derived from Adorno's critique of identity thinking to explain the persistence of gender inequality in the form of gendered occupational segmentation in the UK?

Overview of thesis

In Chapter One the empirical problem of gendered occupational segmentation within the UK is set up. Whilst acknowledging that this phenomenon is framed within a fixed, binary ontology I set out in the first part of the chapter some of the changes within UK society which reflect a more fluid gender ontology in relation to feminist thinking, the law and the media. This is in contrast to the dualist approach that continues to underpin the way in which occupational segmentation is generally researched and analysed at a policy level. After a brief historical overview of gendered occupational segmentation in the UK, I present and discuss in the second part of the chapter the evidence behind current patterns of horizontal and vertical segmentation. Further, I explain why it is problematic and therefore why it is an important topic of research. The question remains, therefore, as to why this labour market phenomenon persists and how it can be explained. In order to address these questions, a range of theoretical explanations are explored in Chapter Two.

This chapter therefore reviews the academic literature within management and organisation studies, starting with a discussion of early mainstream literature in relation to "women in management", which is based on the notion that women and men are naturally different and therefore have different skills because of these natural traits. The discussion then continues by considering how the subject of

women in management and leadership is presented in critical management studies and organisation studies literature. Although these disciplines have drawn on aspects of Adorno's critical theory, I suggest that they have overlooked his critique of identity thinking and theory of negative dialectics. Likewise, although feminist organisation studies scholars have adopted a critical lens through which to analyse organisational life, they have also overlooked Adorno's critique, adopting instead a poststructuralist approach.

I then move on to consider the focus of critical diversity studies scholars, in particular their non-essentialist understanding of diversity. By way of trying to find alternatives to the binary thinking that lies at the heart of organisational thought a brief overview of literature is provided that considers a more "fluid" approach to this pervasive dualism, including queer theory and the Deleuzian concept of "becoming-woman" (Deleuze and Guattari, 2003: 272). This overview of the existing literature, particularly with regard to the ways in which critical diversity scholars have analysed essentialism and the sex/gender binary, allows me to demonstrate that more work is needed in order to explain the persistence of occupational segmentation. I therefore turn in the next chapter to a consideration of Adorno's critique of identity thinking and his theory of non-identity thinking.

As such, Chapter Three discusses the relevance of Adorno's work and the ways in which it can be drawn on to analyse further the concept of essentialism with regard to issues of gender inequality in organisations. In particular, by drawing on the ways in which Adorno accounts for identity thinking (for instance, through his analysis of classification and categorisation, the priority of the object, exchange value and instrumental reasoning), I demonstrate the possibilities for contributing to feminist literature by identifying some of the contiguities between Adorno and

certain, critical strands of feminism, with an emphasis on the work of de Beauvoir and Butler. In particular, I show the ways in which Adorno's critique can resolve some of the tensions between critical feminists and poststructural feminists. Finally, it is suggested that Adorno's dialectical philosophy of history, as a form of genealogy, can help to highlight the historical nature of the essentialist stereotypes underpinning occupational segmentation. This concept of genealogy is also used as a tool by Foucault in order to uncover the "buried, subjugated knowledges" underpinning the formation of subjects (Foucault, 1980: 83) as well as feminists such as Butler (Butler, 1990a; Butler, 1993).

As mentioned earlier in the Introduction, Chapter Four explains the methodology underpinning my empirical analysis, which is a Foucauldian critical discourse analysis (CDA). I set out and justify the choice of a Foucauldian approach to CDA by pointing to the contiguities between Foucault and Adorno. In particular, I show how Foucault helps to identify the ways in which subjects are produced by dominant discourses. Adorno's method of immanent critique, on the other hand, helps to focus my analysis in Chapter Six on the subject-object relation and the remainder that emerges from that interaction within non-identity thinking. Further, I discuss and justify the documentary methods I adopt for carrying out my research into corporate diversity webpages and annual reports from 30 FTSE 100 companies. This sample was chosen from the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report which lists all 100 companies in order of the number of women directors on their boards, picking the top 15 and bottom 15 companies.

Chapter Five offers an analysis of the material gathered from the websites and annual reports of the 30 FTSE 100 companies from a critical discursive perspective at both a micro and a macro level. By applying a genealogical lens to

the "things said" (Foucault, 1991a: 63) by companies, this chapter reveals "buried, subjugated knowledges" (Foucault, 1980: 83) particularly in relation to the formation of subjects. It does so by showing how subjectivity is discursively constructed, highlighting the essentialist nature of the discourses in relation to how women are portrayed by both the text and images such that women are simultaneously framed as perfect and imperfect subjects. These discourses are underpinned by a number of taken for granted assumptions, which are, in turn, undermined by contradictions that are inherent within organisational diversity discourse. These findings led me to conclude that organisational diversity discourse is predicated on essentialist discourses of women.

The final chapter mobilises the relevant concepts of Adorno's work, as reviewed in Chapter Three, to offer more theoretical insights based on the data from my sample. In particular I focus on the finding that it has produced a gendered, organisational subject with certain innate, essential qualities. The main method of analysis is immanent critique which problematises the subject-object relationship, thereby underpinning Adorno's emphasis on the priority of the object and the notion of the remainder. By mobilising the notion of negative ontology, I trace some of the ways in which discourse covers over contradictions. This chapter also unpacks the dynamics underpinning essentialism by highlighting the conflation between the concepts of sex and gender within corporate diversity discourse and the object of the body. Among other findings, I show that the business case in particular and corporate diversity discourse more broadly is based on essentialism, a form of identity thinking. Despite the continued discursive use of equal opportunities by companies in my sample, I demonstrate how they have instrumentalised the concept by abandoning the ethos of social justice, replacing it with the identarian

discourse of exchange value, rendering women as little more than objects to be managed and controlled by virtue of being subject to biological classification. In other words, corporate diversity discourse is predicated on essentialist stereotypes of women who are viewed, not as individuals, but as members of a group with certain sexed and gendered characteristics. As identity thinking assumes that the object equals the concept, organisations mistake these gendered concepts for the sum total of the object of woman's body.

I conclude that by drawing on Adorno's critique to theorise the concepts of sex and gender within diversity discourse, my study revitalizes the connection between CMS and the critical poststructural theories of feminist organisational scholarship. In addition, his critique of identity thinking can resolve the concerns expressed by feminist poststructuralists about the dangers of an essentialist subject. Further, by allowing for the dissonance between the subject and the object (the remainder), the term "woman" can be opened up to mean something other than we declare her to be. In effect, Adorno's critique highlights the dangers of the essentialist subject at the heart of identity thinking whilst emphasising the need to allow for the dissonance between the subject and the object such that the term woman can be fluid rather than fixed.

My aims in this thesis, which examines the persistence of gendered occupational segmentation in the UK, are three-fold. The first is to explore the extent to which it is underpinned by essentialism; the second is to consider whether essentialism lends itself to an analysis by negative dialectics; and the third is to assess the ways in which that analysis can contribute to feminist organisational studies and critical diversity scholarship. With regard to methodology, I critically analyse the diversity discourse of 30 FTSE 100 companies, highlighting the

essentialism that underpins it, and the ways in which organisations have conflated biological and cultural essentialism. With regard to theory, I focus primarily on the concepts of sex and gender and immanently analyse the ways in which they have been conflated with the object of women's bodies such that the body of woman is assumed to equal the concept of her sexed and gendered characteristics. By drawing on Adorno's theory of negative dialectics, I suggest that this essentialism can be analysed and understood in terms of the identity thinking that permeates organisational discourse such that women are classified and categorised according to their supposedly natural and social characteristics.

Chapter One

Gender binaries and occupational segmentation

Introduction

As outlined above, the main question addressed in this thesis is why gendered occupational segmentation in the UK has proved to be so persistent. In order to consider this issue, I turn to insights from Adorno's critique of identity thinking which highlights the binary thinking underpinning organisational discourse, and which is discussed in more depth in Chapter Three. As a basis for this later discussion, the first part of Chapter One highlights the tensions between the dualist ontology that underpins organisational diversity discourse and the more fluid gender ontology that is developing within feminist thinking, equality law and the media. These developing ontologies are significant, not just because they reflect a growing, cultural movement that is challenging binary thinking (at least to some extent), but also because, by comparison, they simultaneously emphasise the ways in which identity thinking remains prevalent within organisational diversity discourse.

The second part of the chapter sets out the empirical problem of occupational segmentation with a partial focus on the gender composition of corporate boards among FTSE100 companies, emphasising the dualist ontology that underpins the way in which the phenomenon has historically been researched, analysed and understood. It therefore starts with a brief overview of the history of occupational segmentation in the UK, focusing mainly on the period starting with the industrial revolution (when the labour market started to clearly bifurcate on the basis of gender), followed by a more detailed overview of current, empirical patterns. It also considers the impact that occupational segmentation has on the lives of women and

girls, in particular the undervaluation of women's work leading to pay inequality which lasts throughout the lifetime of some women. As a significant injustice facing women in general, it therefore constitutes an important topic of research. As already explained, in later chapters I draw on Adorno's critique of identity thinking to explore how it can help to elucidate the current ontological and empirical gap between the growing fluidity within feminist and academic thinking, which I now go on to consider, and the continued categorical approach that dominates corporate diversity discourse.

The search for a gender-fluid ontology

A significant strand of feminist thinking has been engaged in challenging dualistic ontologies (Harding, 1986) with a particular focus on the binary dualism of male/female (Burkitt, 1999) and nature/culture (Ortner, 1972) since at least the late eighteenth century (Calás and Smircich, 2014; Pringle and Strachan, 2015). This is perhaps not surprising as it was only in the early 1800s that Western society started classifying humans into a two-sex model rather than the previous one-sex model which centred around hierarchically ordered versions of the same type (Sanz, 2017). By the end of the eighteenth/beginning of the nineteenth century, feminist thinkers such as Mary Wollstonecraft and Harriet Martineau started to challenge the public/private dualism whereby the public sphere had become naturalised as a male province by virtue of excluding women from it, while the private sphere had become identified as female (Calás and Smircich, 2014). Other dualisms have subsequently become the targets of much feminist theorising such as reason versus emotion, objectivity versus subjectivity and mind versus the body (Harding, 1986). However, as Harding (1986) points out, the extent to which the sex/gender binary has also underpinned feminist thinking is not always acknowledged. This is not to infer that it

is not useful but rather to recognise that as a widespread dualistic practice, feminists have to operate, think and exist "within the very dichotomizing we criticize" (Harding, 1986: 662), not least because it structures the way we view the world. This dualistic bind presents feminists with a dilemma in the sense that, whilst being critical of essentialist dualisms, they also have to mobilise the category "woman" for emancipatory purposes.

Although de Beauvoir made the insightful observation in the 1940s that "One is not born, but rather becomes, woman" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 283), it was not until the 1960s that the English language distinction between sex and gender came into general use when sex was taken to mean the biological components that are determinative of whether someone is male or female, while gender referred to "behavior [sic], feelings, thoughts and fantasies that … do not have primarily biological connotations" (Stoller, 1974: vi-vii). Second wave feminists in the late 1960s and early 1970s developed this discourse into a clear distinction between biological sex and socially constructed gender of masculinity and femininity (Rubin, 1975), thereby facilitating the argument that just because some women could give birth and breastfeed could not explain the division of labour within the nuclear family, capitalist institutions and organisations (Hartmann, 1979).

However insightful this approach, it resulted in the unhelpful assumption that because there are two sexes, there must be two genders (Oakley and Mitchell, 1997). This assumption then led onto a debate among feminists about the usefulness of the terms and the idea that it might be more illuminating to view gender as something which people "do" (West and Zimmerman, 1987: 126). By the late 1980s, however, gender had become a substitute for sex in many public and scientific fora (Oakley and Mitchell, 1997). For instance, people started being asked

on application forms for their gender, scientists referred to gender differences in the womb and doctors talked about the right to choose a baby's gender (Oakley and Mitchell, 1997). Likewise, some feminists started using the terms more or less interchangeably (MacKinnon, 1989), on the basis that the sex/gender divide was "a construct of culture rather than a given of nature" (Ortner, 1972: 28). The end result, according to Oakley and Mitchell (1997) was to defuse the power of the concept of gender to explain men's and women's different social situations. Gender had, in other words, "become as useless as sex" (Oakley and Mitchell, 1997: 52).

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, the American philosopher Judith Butler offered a radically different approach to this binary frame by asking whether being female stems from a "natural fact" or a "cultural performance"; and therefore whether this so-called "naturalness" could come about as a result of "discursively constrained performative acts" (Butler, 1990a: x). As such, she reasoned that the category of sex was, in reality, normative, a regulatory ideal; and like gender, was culturally constructed (Butler, 1990a), concepts which are explained in more detail in Chapter Three. Although there is a material reality, she argued that we can only access it through concepts (Butler, 1993). There are, therefore, no essences of masculinity or femininity inherent within the body that give rise to gender identity. Instead they are created through bodily performances that are produced and articulated by the law of sex (Butler, 1993). As such the body acts not because of any essence of individuality contained within it but because of the power invested in it by the "symbolic law of sex" which compels these citations called "feminine and masculine" (Butler, 1993: 15).

Although "new materialist" feminists agree that the body plays an important role in the performance of gender, they argue that language has been granted too

much power in analysing it, thereby reducing materiality to a form of "cultural representation" (Barad, 2003: 801). Instead, they suggest that feminists turn their attention to the ways in which the body's materiality "actively matter[s] to the processes of materialization" (Barad, 2003: 809) and the role it plays in the operation of power. The key point according to these feminist theorists therefore is that biology and culture are inter-dependent (Frost, 2011). As such the sex/gender account of difference underestimates the degree to which culture is involved in producing bodily systems (Fausto-Sterling, 2005). Nature and culture cannot therefore be seen as dichotomous terms as nature has to be understood as the field on which culture elaborates and develops itself (Grosz, 2008). As matter and biology need to be appreciated as active elements in their own right, new materialists advocate abandoning the model of causation in which either culture or biology is deemed to be determinative and instead adopt a model in which causation is perceived as more complex and multi-linear (Frost, 2011).

Transgender and intersex activists have also articulated criticisms of the sex/gender distinction, pointing to the ways in which the cultural rules of gender were literally being inscribed on intersexed bodies through medical procedures, thereby disrupting both the sex binary and the sex/gender distinction (Sanz, 2017). Drawing on Butler's insight that gender is performative and the idea that those who "fail to do their gender right are regularly punished" (Butler, 1988: 522), trans women started to articulate a resistance to the dominant gender system on the basis that it was formulated on false beliefs about gender that were not only harmful but, in some instances, downright oppressive (Bettcher, 2013; Priola et al., 2018). By rejecting the dominant gender culture which tends to assume that genitals should act as the criteria for deciding who is a man or a woman, trans women felt able to

reject the claim that they were really a man after all (Bettcher, 2016). Instead they argued that the concepts of gender and woman should be expanded to include "something that wasn't included in it before" (Bettcher, 2013: 244). So rather than saying that trans bodies are "mixed" or "in between", thereby assuming a dominant interpretation of what bodies should resemble, it should be possible to recognise "a multiplicity of trans worlds in relation to a multiplicity of dominant ones" (Bettcher, 2014: 390). This approach also challenges the notion that cisgender people (whose gender identity is the same as the sex they were assigned at birth) automatically represent the "default human condition" (Overall, 2013: 264). In other words, gender can be undone or redone depending on the criteria that are used to determine what it means.

Multiplicity and fluidity in the media and popular culture

The debate about multiplicity and fluidity within academia and feminism is also finding parallels with representations of gender within the media, popular culture and equality law, much of it focused around what constitutes a woman (Doward, 2018; Faye, 2018; Fisher, 2018; Hattenstone, 2018; Kentish, 2018; Murray, 2017). For instance, the BBC made a series of short films in 2018 about transgenderism alongside discussions about the implications of potential changes to the Gender Recognition Act 2004 and in turn, to the Equality Act 2010 (BBC, 2018). Likewise, Channel 4 broadcast a series of programmes entitled Genderquake with a focus on what it means to be a man or a woman in twenty first century Britain (Channel 4, 2018a), which it followed up with a documentary entitled "What makes a woman?" and advertised as an examination of the "changing world of gender and identity" (Channel 4, 2018b: webpage). For its part, ITV broadcast a TV mini-series in 2018 entitled Butterfly about an 11-year old called Max who "identifies as a girl

and wants to live her life as Maxine" (IMDB, 2018a: webpage); while the US comedy drama Transparent about a divorced transgender dad which first aired in early 2014 is now on its fifth season on Amazon in the UK (IMDB, 2018b), boasting viewing figures for the third season in the region of 1.3 million (Spangler, 2018). In support of these attempts to challenge gender stereotypes, the UK Committee of Advertising Practice now bars advertisers from depicting "harmful gender stereotypes" such as a man's inability to change nappies or a woman's inability to park a car (Advertising Standards Authority, 2018: webpage); whilst Facebook offers a range of options in terms of identity labels such as agender, gender questioning and two-spirit (Walker, 2019).

Non-binary and androgynous people and ideas have also been influential for several decades within the music industry (Bendix, 2017). For instance, both David Bowie and Prince explored androgyny in the 1980s (Macpherson, 2015), while the Eurovision song contest was won in 1998 by a transgender person, Dana International (Denham and Shepherd, 2017) and subsequently by the self-described "bearded drag queen" Conchita Wurst in 2014 (Conchita, Undated: webpage). More recently, singers such as Miley Cyrus, Angel Haze, Young Thug, Ezra Furman and Christine and the Queens, among others, have all openly identified with the concept of being gender neutral (Bendix, 2017; Jackman, 2017).

A further indication of increasing fluidity in society is the number of gender-neutral toilets which are starting to appear in the UK, including universities (Ferguson, 2018; Regan-Mears, 2018); government departments (Bovens and Marcoci, 2018) and the BBC (Kent Smith, 2018). They are also increasingly an issue for schools which are finding that more children are demanding access to gender-neutral spaces on the basis that they want to change their identity (Taylor, 2015;

The Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust, 2018). The Mayor of London, Sadiq Khan, also called for greater consideration to be given to the introduction of gender-neutral toilets across the capital in his 2017 Plan for London (Mayor of London, 2017a), having introduced them in City Hall along with gender-neutral showers (Deacon, 2018), arguing that they help "trans and non-binary people feel more comfortable" (Mayor of London, 2017b: webpage). Although the UK has yet to introduce gender-neutral traffic lights, the multinational conglomerate, Siemens, recently manufactured a range of diversity images for use on a limited number of traffic lights in Manchester to celebrate the city's 2018 Pride Festival, which were inspired by a similar set of traffic signals produced for Bournemouth Pride in 2018 and London Pride in 2016 (Hutton, 2018).

That is not to say that this growing awareness of multiplicity and fluidity is without its critics, including from within feminist thinking and activism. Indeed, the UK government's proposal to amend the 2004 Gender Recognition Act (GRA) to allow for self-identification has stoked a heated debate between feminists who oppose it (so-called trans exclusionary radical feminists or TERFs) and those who support it (Bindel, 2004; Minou, 2010; O'Hagan, 2018; Reilly-Cooper, 2016). In particular, it has generated a discussion about whether trans women are real women (Murray, 2017). The argument has become particularly toxic in relation to the impact that self-identification might have on same sex services (such as women's refuges) and occupational requirements (such as a stipulation that a female counsellor is required to work with female victims of rape) if it was enacted. These exceptions are currently lawful under the Equality Act 2010 and although the government has made clear that it has no intention of amending the Act (Kentish,

2018), it acknowledges the potential implications that reform of the GRA might have on the way these exceptions operate (Government Equalities Office, 2018a).

It is, however, important to make clear that despite all these cultural changes and debates, corporate diversity discourse in the UK remains largely bifurcated and hierarchically ordered. It is perhaps not surprising, therefore, that gendered occupational segmentation continues to be researched and analysed mainly in binary terms (male and female, men and women). As a result, feminists end up having to think "within the very dichotomizing" that they are criticising (Harding, 1986: 662). As indicated previously, however, it is not always disadvantageous for feminists to retain dualism as an "analytical and political device" (Fournier and Smith, 2006: 160). Otherwise how else would we be able to understand and challenge the subordination and oppression of women, for instance in the form of gendered occupational segmentation. It is therefore important to acknowledge at this point the binary terms in which the following section is framed, but at the same time to suggest that attempts to remedy and address it can best be understood, not by abandoning dualism, but by rethinking it critically and reflexively. In order to do so, Adorno's critique of identity thinking provides a useful starting point in that his insights alert us to the need to look behind binary thinking at the subjectivistic, hierarchical type of cognition that underpins the history of occupational segmentation (which I now consider), rather than focus on the concepts of sex and gender which draw us back endlessly into identity thinking.

The binary history of occupational segmentation

It is far from easy to track the history of the sexual division of labour which consigned women "to the category of Other" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 79), not least because changes occurred at different times in different societies (Lerner, 1986).

Engels (1972: 30), for his part, ascribed the "world historic defeat of the female sex" to the development of technology (such as the plough) and the appearance of private property in the form of cattle which ushered in a change in the division of labour between public and private. Feminists, such as Simone de Beauvoir (2011), on the other hand, argued that Engels was unable to explain why the transition from a communitarian regime (in which there was equality between the sexes) to one of private property necessarily led to women's enslavement. As she points out, there is no obvious reason why the division of labour by sex could not have continued to be one of "friendly association" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 66). Data gathered by anthropologists bear out de Beauvoir's theory that, although there were gender-based divisions of labour in the earliest hunting and gathering societies, nothing in the structure of these egalitarian-band societies suggested that women had to show deference to men (Leacock, 1981).

As it is well beyond the scope of this thesis to trace the development of the sexual division of labour from these early societies through the intervening millennia, suffice to say that it ebbed and flowed as societies developed into agrovillages, followed by a process of urbanisation and a system of feudalism that lasted until the later Middle Ages, when waged labour along with waged sex differentials started to appear (Boulding, 1976). With the start of the industrial revolution, the labour market began to bifurcate even more clearly on the basis of sex as a result of new and more varied occupations opening up in the paid work force, which soon became either predominantly female or male (Preston, 1999). For instance, when spinning was transferred from the home into factories in the late eighteenth/early nineteenth century, the work was highly segregated with women working at the power looms

and preparatory machinery in the mills (Engels, 2001) while men worked at the spinning machines (Hartmann, 1976).

Indeed, in the second half of the eighteenth century, there was a marked shift in women's employment from domestic work to factory work (Higgs, 1987), although the process of recording the jobs they did was often haphazard as it was not a priority for male census observers (Higgs and Wilkinson, 2016). There then followed two periods during the two world wars when both the employment rates and the jobs done by women changed dramatically (Braybon and Summerfield, 1987). By the 1970s, employment trends showed a significant lowering of the overall level of segmentation in the UK (Hakim, 1996), mainly as a result of an influx of women onto the labour market and their entry into white-collar male occupations. For instance, in 1971 about 53% of working age women in the UK were in work (ONS, 2013); by 2018, that figure had risen to 71% (ONS, 2018f). At the same time, men's employment rate in the UK fell from 92% in 1971 (ONS, 2013) to 80% in 2018 (ONS, 2018f). Although only a quarter of UK women with children were working in 1973, that figure had risen to just over 50% by 2018 (ONS, 2018c).

Two main factors came together to bring about this so-called feminisation of the labour market (Standing, 1999) – the introduction of anti-discrimination legislation and structural changes to the economy. Until the early 1970s, sex discrimination was widely accepted as a fact of life which played a major role in excluding women from men's jobs. However, challenges by feminist movements and strike action by women such as the sewing machinists at Ford Dagenham in 1968 transformed public attitudes and governmental views about excluding people from jobs because of their sex (Binard, 2017). These challenges ultimately resulted in the Sex Discrimination Act and the Equal Pay Act in the UK, both of which became

effective in 1975, and which impacted further on women's employment rates (ONS, 2013). In addition, the contraceptive revolution from 1965 onwards gave women (at least the option of) independent control over their fertility for the first time (Binard, 2017). The other significant factor involved a shift from a manufacturing-based economy to one heavily reliant on service industries (Kalleberg, 2009), combined with a process of deregulation by governments in the 1980s in the UK and a reduction in employment protection (Scott et al., 2010). Nevertheless, despite the influx of women into the UK labour market since the 1970s, gendered patterns of employment have persisted.

Current patterns of occupational segmentation

These patterns are generally referred to as horizontal and vertical segmentation (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2017), and are explained briefly below. In addition, as some of the focus of this thesis is on board level or vertical segmentation, I also draw from statistics highlighting the specific importance of this dimension.

Horizontal segmentation occurs when workers of one sex are disproportionately concentrated in certain sectors of the economy. In the UK, women dominate a number of narrow – generally poorly paid – ones. These include caring, leisure and other services such as health and social work where 78% of the workforce are women. They hold 70% of the jobs in education and constitute 66% of the workforce in the administrative and secretarial sector (House of Commons Library, 2018a). Conversely, women constitute only 14% of employees in construction, 22% in transportation and storage and 24% in manufacturing (House of Commons Library, 2018b). The gap is particularly large for skilled trades

occupations and process, plant and machine operatives where men comprise 92% and 89% of full-time employees respectively (House of Commons Library, 2018a).

The picture is no less stark in relation to vertical segmentation which is when women are clustered in low-status roles within organisations. For instance, although women currently account for about 47% of people in employment in the UK (House of Commons Library, 2017), only 34% of management roles are held by women (Chartered Management Institute, 2017). There are even fewer women in the top jobs - just 7% of chief executive officers of FTSE 100 companies in 2019 were women, while they constituted just 2% in FTSE 250 companies (Cranfield University School of Management, 2019). As for chief finance officers, just 13% of FTSE 100 companies currently employ women in these roles, while the figure drops to 10.4% among FTSE 250 companies (Cranfield University School of Management, 2019). Overall, just 8% of women in employment work as managers or senior officials, compared to 13% of men (House of Commons Library, 2019).

At board level the disparity is just as striking with women in the UK currently holding 32% of directorships of FTSE 100 companies (Cranfield University School of Management, 2019). Clearly this is a significant increase compared to 2011 when the figure in the UK stood at 12.5% (Davies, 2015). However, although women hold 38.9% of non-executive directorships (directors without management responsibilities), the percentage in executive posts (directors with management responsibilities) currently stands at just 10.9% compared to just under 6% in 2013 (Cranfield University School of Management, 2019). These figures drop to 32.8% in the FTSE 250 for non-executive directorships; and 8.4% for executive directorships held by women (Cranfield University School of Management, 2019).

These figures are significant, not least because as Sealy points out, "what is valued in the boardroom is valued throughout the organization" (Sealy, 2010: 193). In other words, if women are valued as board members, they are more likely to be valued at all levels of organisations. Indeed, promotion to senior management is often a route into the boardroom. Research has found that boards with a higher representation of women are more likely to have women in senior management and more equal ratios of male to female pay (Terjesen and Singh, 2008), as a result of a more gender supportive environment (Hoobler et al., 2018).

Consequences of occupational segmentation

Despite the increase in the numbers of women board directors from 12.5% in 2011 (Davies, 2015) to 32% in 2019 (Cranfield University School of Management, 2019), stereotypes about the suitability of women as board members still persist. For instance, the team behind the government-backed Hampton-Alexander Review published some of the most egregious explanations they heard from FTSE company chairs for not appointing women to their boards. These included the assertions that "women don't fit into the board environment" and that "[m]ost women don't want the hassle or pressure of sitting on a board" (Gov.uk, 2018: webpage), indicating the persistence of the belief that management is a "manly" business (Gipson et al., 2017; Heilman, 2001: 660; Stoker et al., 2012). Likewise, research by the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) uncovered a tendency by organisations to look for "chemistry" or "fit" (meaning personality and cultural similarity) with other board members rather than specific skills and personal qualities (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2016: 59). Apart from being potentially unlawful, widespread essentialist beliefs also hamper the lives of girls from birth in terms of the stereotyped expectations that they generate, feeding into the subject choices

they make at school, the undervaluation of their skills in organisations, insecurity of employment and the gender pay gap that is a permanent feature of their working lives, as explained briefly in the following sections.

a) Stereotypes and subject choices at school

Given that gendered occupational segmentation is so entrenched in the UK, it is hardly surprising that the gender stereotypes that underpin it are difficult to challenge, not least because they start to have an effect from a very early age, reinforcing de Beauvoir's (2011) point that we are not born women but rather become them over a period of time. This process often begins with the classification of the baby's sex (either at or sometimes before birth) and thereafter reinforced by "sex-typed comments" (Oakley, 1972: 173) about their behaviour and appearance. Indeed, research has found that children as young as two are aware of their own sex. Between four and six years old (when children begin to form essentialist beliefs about gender), they are aware that they will grow up to be a man or a woman (McKinnon, 2014; Saini, 2017). For instance, a recent report found that, because gender stereotypes are already embedded by the age of seven, girls are far more likely to select careers traditionally seen as "women's work", such as hairdressing, nursing and fashion design, while boys aspire to become mechanics, airline pilots and army officers (Education and Employers, 2018a), thereby reinforcing horizontal segmentation. Likewise, a BBC programme focusing on gender stereotypes found that children as young as seven were almost universally convinced that boys "are cleverer" than girls and "better at being in charge" (Bloom, 2017).

Rather than diminishing, these views seem to endure and feed into the subject choices of children at about age 14 when pupils in the UK have some autonomy for the first time over what they want to study. In 2018 at GCSE level (or

equivalent), girls constituted the vast majority of students studying home economics, health and social care and performing arts, while boys opted for subjects such as construction, technology and engineering (Joint Council for Qualifications, 2018b). A similarly disproportionate number of girls chose English literature, psychology and sociology at A level. Conversely, a disproportionate number of male pupils chose subjects such as computing, physics, economics and further maths (Joint Council for Qualifications, 2018a). This segmentation is just as stark in apprenticeship training, with women representing the majority of participants for the three lowest paid apprenticeships - hairdressing, health and social care, early childcare and early years education (Education and Employers, 2018b). Stereotypes about apprenticeships are also well entrenched with 63% of boys stating in a survey that they did not want to "stand out from the crowd" (Fuller and Unwin, 2014: 192) by working in a characteristically female apprenticeship.

Historical research, however, suggests that different societies have supported different images of what is an appropriate role for women and men at different points in time (Abbott et al., 2005). For instance, jobs that have since been categorised as "female" occupations such as teaching, shop assistants and office work were, in the nineteenth century, all thought to be totally unsuitable for women (Hartmann,1976). Yet there were about 400,000 women shop assistants in Britain by 1931 and 134,000 female teachers by 1938 (Braybon and Summerfield, 1987). And although the 1871 census for England and Wales listed only 1,446 female clerks, there were almost 125,000 by 1911 (Lewis, 1988). Stereotypes underpinning which jobs are said to be suitable for women also vary depending on geographical location. For instance, in Morocco clerical work used to be performed almost exclusively by men

but mostly by women in the US and the UK; while service work used to be a male preserve in Turkey but employed many women in Bangladesh (Jacobs, 1989).

It follows from the above that if women are overrepresented in some occupations in some countries but underrepresented in the same occupations in others, the present sexual division of labour is neither natural nor inevitable. Nevertheless, the notion that stereotypes are natural, deriving from women's so-called essence as mothers and carers, persists (Grimshaw and Rubery, 2007). It is no coincidence therefore that many of the job sectors in which women predominate (such as cooking, caring and cleaning) are directly reflected in the skills that have historically been attributed to the ones that women accrued within the home. This association between women's occupations and their alleged natural skills as mothers and carers therefore remains a crucial element in the rationale underpinning occupational segmentation in today's labour market in the UK. As the home is not recognised as a valid training ground, however, the core competences acquired by women in the role of homeworker are often undervalued by employers, as I discuss in the next section (Koskinen Sandberg and Saari, 2018; Rubery, 2017).

b) Undervaluation of women's skills

The process whereby women's skills became universally undervalued and underpaid by comparison with those of men developed over many centuries (Cockburn, 1985), becoming more intense after the industrial revolution, particularly with the introduction of a ten-hour day for women and young people aged between 13 and 18 under the Factory Act 1847 (Parliament.uk, Undated). This legislation, supported for various reasons by social reformers and male trade unionists alike, ensured that women (particularly married women) were discouraged from taking

male factory jobs (Hartmann, 1976). As part of this process of excluding women from factories, men simultaneously increased their control over technology and production (Hartmann, 1976). By supporting the concept of a so-called family wage, trade unions closed down opportunities for women (Witz, 1992) and also excluded them from membership so that they could not gain the competences they needed to secure a similar standard of living as men (Cockburn, 1985; Hartmann, 1976). Indeed, women were not admitted to membership of the Amalgamated Engineering Union until 1943 (Cockburn, 1985). Male trade unionists employed these exclusionary tactics with the explicit goal of protecting their status as skilled workers because of the particular threat that women were perceived to pose (Rose, 1988), a threat that was still apparent as recently as the 1980s. For instance, the men interviewed for Cockburn's (1983) study of compositors in the London news trade felt threatened not just by the introduction of new technology, but also by the prospect that women might enter the trade. Their technological skills therefore represented a source of class power as well as an aspect of gender power, so much so that Cockburn posits that "skill as a political concept is more far-reaching than the class relations of capitalism - it plays an important part in the power relations between men and women" (Cockburn, 1983: 116).

As a result, women were often prevented from doing the same grade of work as men, even when engaged in the same industry, according to British twentieth century social campaigners such as the Webbs (Hartmann, 1976). Inevitably, having been prevented from gaining equal skills, their work was, in fact, not equal with that of the men (Hartmann, 1976). However, it has also been posited that because men's activities are typically valued above those of women, occupations in which women dominate pay less at least partly because women do them (Brynin and Perales,

2016; Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2017; Perales, 2013). In other words, it is the gender composition of the workforce that shapes pay, not necessarily the occupation itself. For instance, although some occupations in which women now constitute a majority (such as clerical workers and teachers) were once dominated by men, over time both the pay and the status associated with these jobs have diminished (Brynin and Perales, 2016; Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2017; Perales, 2013). This equation of women as unskilled and men as skilled is so ingrained that once a particular job is identified as being women's work, the skill content is downgraded (Koskinen Sandberg and Saari, 2018; Phillips and Taylor, 1980; Ronen, 2018), a phenomenon that still persists today. For instance, not only do male graduates have higher employment rates (86%) than females (79%), they are also more likely to have a high- or upper-middle-skill job (ONS, 2017). High-skill jobs include professions such as engineers, doctors and accountants while upper-middle-skill jobs include professions such as electricians and plumbers (ONS, 2017). Across all qualification groups, male graduates earned £9,500 more than female graduates on average in 2018 (Department for Education, 2019).

c) Insecurity of employment

Despite the continued undervaluation of women's work, the number of women in paid employment has increased considerably since the 1970s due to the influx of women into the labour market alongside legislative changes. At the same time that the numbers of women were increasing, however, the concept of regular, full-time employment started to give way to a more diverse pattern, characterised by "informalisation" (Standing, 1999: 585) and "precarity" (Standing, 2011: 48) of employment through more outworking, contract labour, casual and part-time labour, homework and other forms of employment unprotected by laws and regulations.

Indeed, between 1971 and 1993, 93% of the total increase in women's employment was estimated to be in part-time work (Institute for Employment Studies, undated).

Many of these new jobs were (and are) very insecure. For instance, women make up the majority (55%) of people on zero-hours contracts, meaning that they do not have a guaranteed minimum number of hours' work every week (ONS, 2018a). They are also joining the ranks of the self-employed in growing numbers, accounting in 2018 for 33% of them, up from 27% in 2007 (House of Commons Library, 2019). As this increase was most probably driven by the recession (House of Commons Library, 2017), women may not be motivated so much by the autonomy of self-employment as the need to generate an income, albeit a low one. Indeed, many of these newly self-employed women work on a part-time basis (ONS, 2018e). Conversely, very few highly paid jobs are done part-time. For instance, just under 11% of chief executives and senior officials work part time. Of those the vast majority (68.6%) are female (ONS, 2018b). By contrast, the share of workers who are part-time is highest in the lowest-paid occupations (House of Commons Library, 2018b).

d) Gender pay gap

Given the tendency for people who work in female-dominated occupations to earn lower wages, it is hardly surprising that occupational segmentation is widely recognised as one of the main drivers behind the pay gap (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2017). For instance, despite the fact that girls have been outperforming boys at GCSE level since the end of the 1980s, are more likely to stay on to take A levels, take a first degree and go on to postgraduate study than boys (Costa Dias et al., 2016; Morgan and Carrier, 2014), they still suffered a gender pay gap in median pay for full and part-time employees in 2018 of 17.9%

(ONS, 2018d). When part-time employees are excluded (the vast majority of whom are women), the gap was 8.6% in 2018 (ONS, 2018d). The biggest gap for full-time employees is in the finance and insurance sectors where women earn, on average, 26.3% less than men (Meakin et al., 2019).

The gap also increases with age. Although there is little difference in median hourly pay for male and female full-time employees in their 20s and 30s, a large gap emerges among full-time employees aged 35 and over, which is thought to arise because women who have children tend to take time out of the labour market in their 30s and 40s and/or work part time (Costa Dias et al., 2018; House of Commons Library, 2018a). There then tends to be a gradual but continual rise in the wage gap and, by the time the first child is aged 20, women's hourly wages are about a third below men's. Not surprisingly, perhaps, the undervaluation of women's work has an impact on their whole lifecycle. For instance, women retiring in 2018 could expect, on average, a retirement income 29% lower than that of men (Prudential, 2018).

In terms of job status, survey data show that the average pay gap in terms of total pay between male and female managers was 23% in 2018, with male managers on average out-earning their female peers by approximately £8,500 a year (Chartered Management Institute, 2019). This gap increased with seniority. For instance, at entry level, the pay gap between male and female managers was, on average, 4%; while at the top of the pyramid it was 19% (Chartered Management Institute, 2017). In terms of differences at director-level positions, men earned 11.6% more than women in basic salary in 2018; but when bonuses were included, the gap rose to 35.9% and 74.7% when long-term incentive plans were factored in (Chartered Management Institute, 2018).

Conclusion

In this chapter, I briefly charted the different ways in which feminists have approached the sex/gender binary, particularly the contribution of second wave feminists who created a clear distinction between sex as biology and gender as social construction. The discussion also acknowledged the growing criticisms of the sex/gender distinction by trans feminists whose main focus has been on disrupting the hegemony of the current system by challenging the view that genitalia should define gender status. These cultural shifts in favour of greater gender fluidity are also increasingly being reflected in equality law, the media - both print and broadcast - as well as other aspects of popular culture, including the music industry. Although these challenges to binary thinking are useful in the sense that they (at least potentially) encourage an ontology that is more gender fluid, they contrast with the binary history of gendered occupational segmentation. Likewise, they stand in contrast with the hierarchically ordered gender binary that is so prevalent within contemporary corporate diversity discourse.

The discussion in this chapter has therefore highlighted firstly that the heart of the sex/gender debate remains dominated by the dichotomy of sex and gender, albeit one that has become increasingly critical of the historically rigid nature of the two concepts. Secondly, both organisational and legislative discourses remain largely wedded to a binary approach. Thirdly, although it is important for feminists to challenge the boundaries of these concepts, they still have to draw on a dualist ontology as a tool with which to understand, research and analyse contemporary practices which oppress women, including gendered occupational segmentation. Otherwise, how could they continue to draw attention to the extent to which women are, for instance, clustered within low-paying jobs as well as within low-paying

sectors? As highlighted in the second part of this chapter, these patterns have significant consequences for women in terms of the undervaluation of their skills, which contributes in large part to the gender pay gap.

In other words, whilst acknowledging the need to challenge the binary, feminists also have to draw on it in order to focus on injustices within society. I address this dilemma more fully in later chapters but suffice to say here that there is no inherent contradiction between these approaches in the sense that non-identity thinking acknowledges the restrictions within identity thinking whilst simultaneously recognising the need for a more reflexive, dialectical way of thinking. Organisational diversity discourse, on the other hand, remains rigidly bifurcated, a dualism which is indicative of the gender bifurcation within the labour market itself, as I explain more fully in Chapter Five. The question, as indicated earlier, is why this segmentation persists and how it can be explained. In order to consider these questions, I explore a range of theoretical explanations in the next chapter focusing on critical feminist organisation studies literature as well as critical diversity literature.

Chapter Two

Gender ontologies and diversity in feminist organisation studies

Introduction

In Chapter One I identified an epistemological gap between an increasingly gender-fluid way of thinking within popular culture as opposed to the continued binary and hierarchical mode of thinking which generally prevails within organisational diversity discourse. Likewise, gendered occupational segmentation also continues to be researched and analysed in very binary terms. Although this means that feminists who research and write about occupational segmentation have to think "within the very dichotomizing" that they are criticising (Harding, 1986: 662), this is not always a disadvantage, not least because it would not otherwise be possible to challenge the oppression of women. So whilst it is important to be aware of the dangers inherent within binary thinking, it is also important to be aware of the ways on which it can be drawn to analyse the current patterns of occupational segmentation and the ramifications of those patterns for women and girls in the UK. These include a difference in the value attributed to work done by men as opposed to women, with men identified with skilled, well-paid work and women with unskilled, lower-paid, work (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2017). Not only do these perceptions stem from the assumption that women's socialized skills are natural, deriving from their so-called essence as mothers and carers (Grimshaw and Rubery, 2007), but, as explained in the previous chapter, they also lead to stereotypes about the jobs for which women and men are considered to be best suited.

Having explored the persistence of gendered occupational segmentation in the UK and the binary thinking that underpins it in the first chapter, this chapter provides a brief overview of the ways in which gender has been theorised within critical theory and feminist organisation studies. In particular, I identify a shift within the "gendered" organisational literature (Calás and Smircich, 1996: 223) from "gender as attribute" to "gender as process" (Marshall, 1995: 58; Mumby and Putnam, 1992). In order to chart this evolution, the chapter begins with a discussion of early leadership literature in relation to women in management, which is based on the binary notion that women and men are naturally different and therefore have different social or gendered skills (Vinnicombe, 1987). The chapter then moves on to highlight the ways in which critical theory has been drawn on within critical management studies (CMS), a label which is often used to refer to a combination of Frankfurt School and critical poststructural oriented research (Alvesson and Deetz, 2006). I focus in particular on the latter discipline when reviewing relevant literature within feminist organisation studies, as explained below in the section on locating the study, with particular reference to key authors such as Marta Calás and Linda Smircich. The chapter then continues with an overview of the theoretical approaches of critical diversity studies, a discipline which has emphasised the lack of social justice within diversity discourse and the need for a non-essentialist understanding of diversity (Holck et al., 2016; Zanoni et al., 2010). It then finishes with a brief overview of literature that considers the possibilities of a more "fluid" approach within organisational discourse, such as queer theory and the Deleuzian concept of "becoming-woman" (Deleuze and Guattari, 2003: 272) which, I conclude, do not fully challenge the binary nature of existing power structures.

Locating the study

This overview of the literature, with a particular focus on the ways in which the links between an initially emancipatory CMS and feminist accounts of gender have diverged since the 1990s, situates the thesis firmly within feminist organisation studies. By drawing on Adorno, I have been able to develop a theoretical approach revitalising the connection between the two disciplines. Whilst I acknowledge that critical management scholars drew on different aspects of Adorno's philosophy (at least initially), I point out that they have overlooked the ways in which his critique of identity thinking and theory of negative dialectics can contribute to an understanding of why gendered occupational segmentation persists in the UK through an exploration of the concepts of sex and gender. Indeed, feminist theorists including Ashcraft (2016), Calás and Smircich (2014) argue that CMS scholars failed to address the issue of gender at any meaningful level.

Critical organisation scholars have also drawn on Adorno, but my overview shows that their work has focused almost exclusively on his aesthetic theory, with the gendered subject located very much on the periphery. Although feminist proponents of poststructuralism developed a critical analysis of gendered organisational processes, they did not tend to draw explicitly on Adorno's work but rather focused on discursive explanations. Although there is a wide spectrum of feminist theoretical perspectives, as set out in the work of Calás and Smircich (1996, 2006, 2014), I have focused on feminist poststructural theorising in this thesis not just because discourse analysis underpins my analytical framework; but also because it predominantly focuses on the concepts of power and subjectivity. By concentrating on these concepts in this and following chapters, I was able to bring out the distinctiveness of Adorno's critique, thereby highlighting my contribution with

regard to gender within feminist organisation studies. I also draw out the contributions by critical diversity scholars who have analysed essentialism and the sex/gender binary but, again, without explicit reference to Adorno's critique, allowing me to demonstrate that his theoretical framework emphasising the pervasiveness of identity thinking can provide a new lens through which to explain the persistence of gendered occupational segmentation. It also allows me to highlight the consequences that arise from equating the concepts of sex and gender with the object of materiality – in other words, the body.

The gender binary in the women in management literature

As explained in Chapter One, following a dramatic increase in the early to mid-1970s in the number of women entering the labour market, demands for greater equality of opportunity and fairness for women started to be articulated, resulting in the introduction of the first equality legislation in the UK. Around the same time, researchers started to study the emerging phenomenon of the woman manager in terms of their continued under-representation in senior decision-making positions (Calás and Smircich, 2014; Due Billing and Alvesson, 1989). Much of this research developed from mainstream leadership literature, which was broadly based on the assumption that people could be separated into leaders and followers. However, underlying that binary approach was another, unspoken dualism – that males are leaders while females are non-leaders (Bowring, 2004). In doing so, however, it overlooked explanations as to how and why these positions had come to be dominated by men. As such it assumed the gender neutrality of organisational life in which individuals had equal access in so far as they were equally meritorious (Calás and Smircich, 2006; Calás and Smircich, 2014; Calás et al., 2014). Although the women in management literature attempted to challenge the "gender-unaware"

(Marshall, 1995: 54) nature of much of this mainstream leadership literature, it also perpetuated a male/female dichotomy as a result of its focus on the different, innate leadership styles and abilities of men and women (Bowring, 2004; Due Billing and Alvesson, 1989; Gipson et al., 2017).

Indeed, this discourse of natural and cultural differences, which emphasises the supposed differences in the ways that women and men manage, was a prominent feature of the women in management literature (Eagly and Johnson, 1990; Grant, 1988; Rosener, 1990; Vinnicombe, 1987). For instance, Vinnicombe (1987: 20) reported that women managers are "much more collaborative and co-operative and far less hierarchical and authoritative" than men, leading her to conclude that women managers have different working styles to men. Likewise, Grant (1988: 58) argued that "women's experience, traditional values, and ways of behaving, feeling, and thinking" should be celebrated because of the possibility that "female differences" would bring about social change. For their part, Eagly and Johnson (1990) identified a tendency for women to adopt a more democratic or participative style of leadership while men had a more autocratic or directive style. In her study of different leadership styles, Rosener (1990: 120) also identified two distinct management styles, with men tending to engage in "transactional leadership" in the sense that they viewed job performance as a series of transactions with subordinates, involving rewards for good service and punishment for inadequate performance. Women, on the other hand, tended to engage in a more "transformational leadership" style (Rosener, 1990: 120) as a way of getting subordinates to work for the interests of the group, rather than their own self-interest. A later meta-analysis of 45 studies confirmed these earlier findings that women's typical leadership styles tended to be more transformational than those of

men (Eagly et al., 2003). Overall, the research indicated that the role of manager was associated with what were assumed to be masculine traits and styles of leadership (Gipson et al., 2017).

However, although research on style seems to show that women are more likely to manifest transformational leadership than their male peers, it remains unclear whether these traits are the result of innate differences in leadership styles as opposed to gender normative expectations of women leaders (Gipson et al., 2017), or from a combination of the two. This difficulty has been compounded by the plethora of studies which clearly show a gender-similarities perspective as opposed to a gender-differences one (Carothers and Reis, 2013; Hyde, 2005; Wille et al., 2018). This rather uncritical approach to occupational segmentation was also problematic because it not only overlooked the gendered nature of organisations (Acker, 1990; Alvesson and Due Billing, 1992), but also assumed that it was possible to identify universal phenomena that applied to either women or men. As such, this early literature highlighted the need for a more critical approach focusing on structural inequalities and power relations in order to challenge the "biologising" tendency (Kelan, 2008: 430) within mainstream management literature, thereby also questioning the assumption that it is women who should adapt to existing systems and structures, as I now go on to discuss.

Critical management studies literature

Although management has always been subject to some critical analysis since it emerged as a social practice in the late eighteenth century (Fournier and Grey, 2000), it was not until the mid-1980s that a coherent attempt was made to draw on critical theory (particularly the Frankfurt School) within organisation studies under the broad framework of critical management studies or CMS (Alvesson, 1985;

Alvesson and Willmott, 1992a). Two main tendencies are said to characterise this literature (Alvesson, 1996; Alvesson and Deetz, 2006; Hearn et al., 2016). The first draws on critical theory based on the Frankfurt School (considered in this section), while the second draws on postmodernism, a term which, as Calás and Smircich (1996, 2006) point out, encompasses multiple different theoretical approaches and which is considered in the next section. Whilst Alvesson and Deetz (1996, 2006) refer to postmodernism almost as an equivalent to poststructuralism (Hearn et al., 2016), Putnam (1992: 467) describes poststructuralism as a "school" of postmodernism. For their part, Calás and Smircich (1996, 2006) use the terms interchangeably. Given this confusion, I have chosen to use the term poststructuralism in this thesis to mean the theoretical approach most associated with Foucault which emphasises the primacy of discourse and which I consider in more detail in Chapter Four.

Building on the dialectical approach adopted by Benson (1977), the possibility of a critical organisation theory was put forward as a way of analysing power relations and challenging the focus on instrumental rationality that was (and remains) dominant within mainstream theory (Alvesson, 1985; Alvesson and Willmott, 1992a). Likewise, Neimark and Tinker (1987) suggested that Adorno's critique of identity thinking could be used to critically analyse the ways in which organisations conceal the instrumental nature of the ideology lying behind mainstream theory and downplay the complexity of organisational life. In short, therefore, the aim of CMS was to encourage and develop a more critical-emancipatory and dialectical approach towards organisation studies (Benson, 1977; Cooper and Burrell, 1988) in order to show how organisations operate as a means of domination and control (Scherer, 2009). Despite this initial commitment, however,

CMS subsequently shifted its focus more onto the concept of "micro-emancipation" with the aim of looking for "loopholes in managerial and organizational control" (Alvesson and Willmott, 1992b: 446; Alvesson, 1996). This was far from simple, however, given the broad range of theoretical positions - from Marxism to post-structuralism and from feminism to psychoanalysis – that critical academic scholars drew from (Calás et al., 1992; Fournier and Grey, 2000).

Although Calás and Smircich (1992: 607) thought that these new "intellectual currents" would offer the possibility of broadening theory, CMS scholars were instead confronted by an "irreconcilable tension" (Fournier and Grey, 2000: 27) between writing critically but failing to make a difference at a practical level; or running the risk of their critique being appropriated by mainstream management studies. Indeed, this tension is still acknowledged by CMS scholars concerned about becoming complicit in the rise of managerialism, a concern that has, over the last few years, become exemplified (rather ironically) by the "regime of excellence" (Butler and Spoelstra, 2014: 538) within universities in general and business schools in particular (Contu, 2018). Although the concept of critical performativity (Spicer et al., 2009; Spicer et al., 2016) was conceived at least in part to help resolve the tension between pragmatism and critical scholarship (Visser, 2019), it has not always been positively received. This may be because the response has partly been framed around how to take the performative project forward (Fleming and Banerjee, 2016; Hartmann, 2014); partly around the concept of critical performativity itself (Cabantous et al., 2016; Contu, 2019); and partly around the emancipatory potential of critical theory and whether it has been underestimated (Granter, 2014) or even misunderstood by some CMS scholars (Klikauer, 2015). The study of control and resistance has also formed a key plank in the CMS project (O'Toole and Grey,

2016) although much of this work has taken a Foucauldian turn (Granter, 2014), mainly as a result of its focus on the power of language (Fleming and Banerjee, 2016).

Critical organisation studies scholars, on the other hand, have increasingly addressed corporate culture as a site for investigating the contradictions between an emphasis on technological rationality and actual human needs (Granter, 2014). In particular, they have focused on Adorno's aesthetic theory in relation to the mimetic power of art to go beyond instrumental reason (Carr, 2003; Cohen et al., 2006; Cox and Minahan, 2005), arising from the discrepancy between the images projected by art and the "actuality" of the objects themselves (Carr, 2003: 7). In this way, Adorno's theory allows art to release its moment of non-identity with itself. Because works of art exist in an "immanent realm" (Cohen et al., 2006: 111) where they appear to be detached from the conditions of economic production, they remind us that life could be different from the one offered to us by instrumental rationality (Cox and Minahan, 2005). In the same vein, critical organisation studies scholars have analysed the ways in which behaviour within organisations can be unsettled, provoked and determined by the affective capacity of colour (Beyes, 2017; Beyes and De Cock, 2017). It is said, for instance, that Adorno had the walls of his lecture theatre painted grey in the belief that this would minimise distraction and help his students to concentrate (Beyes and De Cock, 2017).

Conversely, art loses its critical function the moment it is released as a commodity onto the free market (Cox and Minahan, 2005), becoming yet another exhibit in the "pantheon of cultural commodities" (Cohen et al., 2006: 111). This seemingly incessant drive towards commodification of the culture industry has also provided a rich seam of research for critical organisation studies scholars (Böhm

and Batta, 2010; Hoof and Boell, 2019; Jones et al., 2016; Larsen, 2017). Used for

the first time by Adorno and Horkheimer in *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, the term

"culture industry" refers to "products which are tailored for consumption by masses,

and which to a great extent determine the nature of that consumption" (Adorno,

1975: 12). For instance, when a painting is reproduced as a photograph or a print, it

no longer represents the unique expression of the original artist but instead

becomes a commodity that can be mass produced and consumed (Hoof and Boell,

2019). Although the image itself has not changed, the shift in production has altered

the perception of the image by those who look at it (Hoof and Boell, 2019). These

images – in the form of news, advertisements and entertainment– are continually

produced and reproduced by the culture and media industries, resulting in a

damaged modern subject who constantly desires to consume more (Böhm and

Batta, 2010). The subject is not just damaged however, it is also gendered. Within

the music industry, for instance, groupies (who are always female) have been

analysed by critical organisation scholars as passive and inauthentic consumers of

mass culture, reinforcing and entrenching cultural stereotypes about women as sex

objects (Larsen, 2017).

Feminist organisation studies literature

Despite the many insights that critical scholars have drawn from Adorno's

theory, it seems fair to conclude from the above overview that CMS and

organisation studies scholars have not to date engaged to any great extent with his

critique of identity thinking and his theory of non-identity thinking in relation to the

concepts of sex and gender. Indeed, CMS has been criticised for failing to engage

with feminist theorising in any meaningful way (Ashcraft, 2016; Calás and Smircich,

2014; Calás et al., 2014), relegating it instead to the status of "special interest group" (Calás and Smircich, 2014: 606).

That is not to say, however, that feminist organisation studies scholars have not developed a critical feminist analysis of organisations but rather that they did not draw explicitly from Adorno's critique. Instead, as indicated earlier, they tended to draw on poststructuralist theory which emphasises the primacy of discourse. The core insight of this linguistic turn (Ashcraft and Mumby, 2004; Calás and Smircich, 2006) rests on an understanding of the contingent nature of the relationship between signifier and signified in language. In effect, these scholars argue that the sign we use to signify one thing or object in the world is only meaningful because it allows us to differentiate it from another sign, rendering it constitutive of the things we know and think (Calás and Smircich, 2006). For poststructuralists, therefore, the function of language is not to "re-present" (Alvesson and Deetz, 2006: 268) objects by defining them in terms of their essential qualities, but rather to constitute them in the first place. The focus, therefore, is not on the object per se but on sets of relational systems that bring the object into being (Alvesson and Deetz, 2006). This "constitutive view" is particularly evident in Foucault's definition of discourse as "practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak" (Foucault, 1972: 49), which is explained in more detail in Chapter Four.

It follows that most poststructural discourses are deconstructive in that they seek to make us sceptical about beliefs concerning truth, knowledge, power and the self that are often taken for granted (Flax, 1987). The focus, therefore, is on breaking down dichotomies to highlight the ways in which they represent artificial categorisations embedded within power relationships (Lazard et al., 2016). In particular, feminist poststructuralists are interested in the ways in which discourses

structure gendered organisational subjectivities and subject positions (Ashcraft and Mumby, 2004; Calás and Smircich, 2006). This represents a significant move away from the binary understanding of gender as an individual attribute adopted by women in management scholars towards an understanding of gender as a "performative ontology" (Tyler, 2011: 11). As such, it draws attention to the ways in which gender is "done" as a social practice and the power relations that underpin that practice (Poggio, 2006), resulting in an organisational culture that remains stubbornly gendered (Gherardi, 1994).

These scholars can therefore be credited with developing the critical insight that organisations, like other social institutions, are gendered through certain texts which generate knowledge and, therefore, power, as I go on to discuss in Chapters Four and Five. As such, aspects of poststructural thought have been applied to topics ranging from total quality and just in time management to broader concepts such as consumer culture and organisational behaviour, the main aim being to challenge universal or taken for granted assumptions around gender roles and the concealed ways in which these are assigned through discourse (Calás and Smircich, 1999). Benschop and Doorewaard (1998, 2012) have also highlighted a range of power-based gender processes or "sub-texts" such as structures, arrangements and practices within organisations which project a perception of equality but which actually prop up gendered inequality. These processes include barriers facing women in terms of organisational group structure (Kanter, 1977a; Kanter, 1977b); discrimination within organisational culture (Mills, 1988); the exclusionary tactics of male trade unionists (Cockburn, 1985; Witz, 1992); and the gendered impact of technology on the labour process (Cockburn, 1983). Building on these insights, Acker (1990, 1992) identified the need for a systematic feminist

theory of gender in order to highlight the gendered nature of organisational systems

and cultures, and in particular the gendered concept of a job. In doing so, she

challenged the notion of abstract jobs and hierarchies, arguing instead that the

"disembodied and universal worker" was, in fact, a man (Acker, 1990: 149; Acker,

1992).

Building on these insights, Acker (1990, 1992) also identified the need for a

systematic feminist theory of gender in order to highlight the gendered nature of

organisational systems and cultures. In doing so, she challenged the notion of

abstract jobs and hierarchies, arguing instead that as the "disembodied and

universal worker" (Acker, 1990: 149) is a man, the concept of a job is, in and of

itself, a gendered concept (Acker, 1990; Acker, 1992). This shift of focus from

"gender as attribute" to "gender as process" (Marshall, 1995: 58) meant that from

now on, critical feminist scholars tended to research organisations as complex

constructs, consisting not just of dominant texts but also of "gender subtexts"

(Benschop and Doorewaard, 1998: 788; Benschop and Doorewaard, 2012). As Ely

and Padavic (2007) point out, this approach was in stark contrast to the literature

emphasising gender differences in the 1970s and early 1980s, which had

overlooked organisational features, such as the women in management literature

outlined above. In other words, the focus for critical feminist scholars from the 1990s

onwards has tended to be on processes that appear gender-neutral but which

actually prop up highly gendered organisational systems (Nkomo and Rodriguez,

2018).

A good example is the tendency for men (particularly highly educated,

professional and managerial workers) to work longer hours than women. As

employees can only work consistently long hours if they have the support of

someone else in their household, overwork feeds into an ideology about women as caregivers, particularly women with children, and men as the "ideal worker" (Cha and Weeden, 2014: 3). That is, someone who can devote all their time to their paid work and who does not have to worry that they will be disrupted by non-work demands (Cha, 2013). As such, the concept of the male breadwinner still underpins the normative ideal of masculinity, whereas the social expectation for women is that they will leave their job or reduce their hours once they have children (Cahusac and Kanji, 2014; Cha, 2013; Rutherford, 2011; Simpson, 1998). Within the neo-liberal and postfeminist workplace, however, the decision to engage (or not) in a culture of overwork is presented as a free choice for individual women to make, as opposed to a systemic problem for organisations to resolve (Adamson, 2017; Lewis et al., 2017), an issue to which I return in more detail in Chapter Five.

In a similar vein, the supposedly objective job evaluation systems criticised by Acker (1990) have given way in the neo-liberal workplace to a reliance on more individualized and person-related competences, linked to merit or performance-type pay systems (Koskinen Sandberg, 2017; Rubery, 2018). This is not to suggest that Acker's analysis is no longer relevant. Rather, these changes support her predictions that gender inequality would reappear in different guises (Rubery, 2018). For instance, instead of a gendered job evaluation system, the focus of analysis has now shifted to a gendered merit-based system.

Although merit is showcased by organisations as an objective set of attributes and skills which can be quantified according to institutionalised standards of productivity (Thun, 2019), it is, like any other organisational system or process, "inevitably linked to the exercise of power" (Martin, 1987: 449). And it is the role of power in defining merit that requires analysis (Śliwa and Johansson, 2014), not least

because it is the group with the most cultural resources (in other words, the most power) who are in a position to construct the parameters of merit in order to maintain the status quo, thereby emphasising the extent to which power is embedded in gender relations (Gander, 2018; Kumra et al., 2019; Nkomo and Rodriguez, 2018). Not surprisingly, therefore, it is mainly powerful men who have the most to lose but the least reason to want to alter the status quo (Humbert et al., 2018). As a result, if women continue to be measured against a yardstick that operates in favour of men, fewer women than men are likely to be selected for middle and senior management posts (Wilson, 2003), thus compounding the myth of the meritocratic organisation (Humbert et al., 2018; Kumra et al., 2019). It may also help to explain why gendered cultures have persisted despite the introduction of anti-discrimination legislation and equal opportunity programmes (Marshall, 1993b), which have, in turn, been supplanted by various "management fads and fashions" (Oswick and Noon, 2014: 31) such as diversity management and the business case for diversity, as set out in the following section.

From equal opportunities to diversity management and the business case

Following the introduction of anti-discrimination legislation in the 1970s, employers responded by introducing equal opportunities policies based on an ethos of group-based structural disadvantage (Johns and Green, 2009; Ozbilgin and Tatli, 2011). In order to tackle a history of gender inequality and to ensure greater social fairness and justice (Noon, 2007), these programmes were aimed at ensuring that women were offered the same opportunities as men (Thomson, 2009). Following widespread strikes in the late 1970s and a shift towards neo-liberalism characterised by an emphasis on the individual, however, equal opportunities programmes started to be recast in the form of diversity management (Pringle and Strachan, 2015).

Around the same time, the UK economic context was changing with a manufacturing sector that was shrinking, and a service sector that was expanding, thereby contributing to the increased employment of women (Kalleberg, 2009). These changes not only facilitated a shift from liberal to neo-liberal governmentality alongside a mood swing in both public and political opinion away from a liberal post-war consensus approach (Blackburn, 2018), they also provided employers with the rationale to drop the discourse of equal opportunities which were increasingly being portrayed as old and failing, held back by governmental regulation (Ozbilgin and Tatli, 2011). Managing diversity, on the other hand, was new and full of potential, allowing the free market to guide organisations (Oswick and Noon, 2014) through a policy of voluntarism rather than government intervention (Ozbilgin and Tatli, 2011).

This new concept of diversity, defined as "a management philosophy of recognizing and valuing heterogeneity in organizations" (Ozbilgin and Tatli, 2011: 1230-1231), implies that the presence of "others" (Ghorashi and Sabelis, 2013: 79) requires managerial intervention. In effect, diversity is a "discourse about difference" (Brewis, 2019: 94), specifically differences between people and how those differences are understood and managed within organisations. As such, diversity does not have a fixed or stable signifier, but can vary and change depending on the context in which it is used (Christensen and Muhr, 2018). Ironically, however, as Lorbiecki and Jack (2000: 26) point out, as differences are signified from an essentialist perspective, the resultant identities are "impenetrable, fixed and stable".

In yet another discursive shift, the concept of inclusion was added ostensibly as a way of incorporating the differences of diversity within the workforce into business practices by increasing the participation of all employees and managing them for commercial advantage (Brewis, 2019; Oswick and Noon, 2014). Although

diversity as "demographic group composition" (Jonsen et al., 2019: 7) may appear different from inclusion as a concept, the two have been increasingly used together as a phrase, particularly in corporate communication. However, despite being a basic human need (Tyler, 2019), it is fair to say that inclusion has turned into an organisational buzzword (Dobusch, 2014), prompting Tyler (2019: 49) to ask whether it should even be assumed to be a "good thing" for feminists to champion. Diversity management has also been credited with venting the white, male backlash that had been directed against equal opportunities programmes (Kersten, 2000; Tatli, 2011), not least perhaps because everyone was now included and no one was left out.

Given that the rhetoric of diversity was underpinned almost exclusively by arguments based on improving performance (Oswick and Noon, 2014), it was not long before the discourse of the business case for diversity started to emerge (Ahonen et al., 2014; Dye and Golnaraghi, 2015; Ozbilgin and Tatli, 2011), defined as "a discursive strategy that connects human differences to an organisation's bottom line" (Mease and Collins, 2018: 665). Based on the premise that diversity was imperative for growth, the argument behind the business case suggested that improvements in productivity and profitability would come about by using the human resources in the economy more efficiently (Davies, 2011; Dye and Golnaraghi, 2015). In adopting this overt economic rationale, critical diversity scholars noted that not only did the business case conveniently discard arguments about social justice, it also facilitated a rigid, essentialist approach (Dzubinski and Diehl, 2018; Ghorashi and Sabelis, 2013) whereby dimensions of diversity such as gender were portrayed as innate characteristics which "define the essence of the individual" (Litvin, 1997: 202).

According to this discourse, women add value to organisations by virtue of their essential qualities (Dzubinski and Diehl, 2018), specifically their "special capacities" and "feminine capabilities" (Gremmen and Benschop, 2011: 180), which include being kind, communal, sympathetic and concerned about others; while men are aggressive, forceful, and decisive (Gipson et al., 2017; Heilman, 2001; Stoker et al., 2012). It is no coincidence, therefore, that the characteristics of so-called female occupations such as caring, cooking and cleaning closely mirror the common stereotypes of women and their supposed abilities (Anker, 1997). Conversely, stereotypically male qualities are considered to be necessary in order to be a successful executive. In other words, not only are most upper level managers men, but good management is thought to be a "manly business" (Heilman, 2001: 660) carried out by someone who embodies masculine stereotypes and characteristics (Gipson et al., 2017; Stoker et al., 2012).

As such, the business case is predicated on the essentialist notion that women have certain female skills and qualities that will result in increased corporate profitability. Indeed, during and after the global financial crisis in 2008, women were positioned as the antidote to the testosterone-fuelled, risk-taking behaviours of men that helped to bring about the crisis (Elliott and Stead, 2018; Roberts, 2014), despite the lack of any evidence that more women in the sector would have averted it (Knights and Tullberg, 2011). For instance Christine Lagarde, the former managing director of the International Monetary Fund, has famously been quoted as saying that if Lehman Brothers had been Lehman Sisters there would not have been a crisis (Elliott and Stead, 2018), implying that women have certain qualities that could have averted it. In a speech in 2018, she maintained this essentialist view, arguing that a higher proportion of women on the boards of banks was associated with

greater financial resilience (International Monetary Fund, 2018). However, although these "post-heroic leadership models" (Elliott and Stead, 2018: 5) suggest the possibility of new ways of performing leadership, they are more likely to reinforce the tendency to stereotype women leaders as women rather than as leaders.

The business case and women on boards

Given its emphasis on performance and productivity, the business case presents an attractive option for companies and for government (Egan, 2018; Johns and Green, 2009). Indeed, it has been heavily endorsed in government publications and government-sponsored reports such as the 2011 and 2015 Davies reports into the under-representation of women on British boards (Davies, 2011; Davies, 2015). For instance, the 2015 Davies review exhorts its readers to "look deeper and wider into the female talent pool" (Davies, 2015: 16). Not only is this "good for boards" but it is also "good for business and good for the economy" (Davies, 2015: 18). The successor report to Davies by Sir Philip Hampton and Dame Helen Alexander also refers to "the costly loss of women's skills" for corporate boards (Hampton-Alexander Review, 2016: 10); while the Gadhia review looking at how women can progress onto the boards of financial services sector companies makes multiple references to the need to nurture female talent (Virgin Money and HM Treasury, 2016).

However, despite extensive research into the issue of whether more women on boards leads to improved organisational performance, the results are far from conclusive (Hoobler et al., 2018). For instance, some studies have reported a positive association (Campbell and Minguez Vera, 2010; Lückerath-Rovers, 2013); others have found no link (Gregory-Smith et al., 2014; Rose, 2007); while others have reported a negative correlation between firm performance and female board

representation (Adams and Ferreira, 2009; Ahern and Dittmar, 2012; Bøhren and Staubo, 2016). This equivocality may be explained by the overwhelmingly quantitative methodology adopted by the authors which has historically involved measuring women's leadership as a dichotomous variable equating gender with biological sex (Hoobler et al., 2018). In other words, instead of theorising gender as a system of relations, identity and power, all of which influence the leadership behaviours of men and women in organisations, these studies have tended to rely on an approach which amounts to little more than "body-counting" (Brown, 2017; Calás et al., 2014: 25) in which all women are assumed to have different (essential) decision-making styles compared to all men (Hoobler et al., 2018).

Problematising the business case

In addition to the business case argument, the lack of women on boards has also been widely critiqued from a social justice perspective (Seierstad, 2015; Seierstad et al., 2017; Terjesen and Sealy, 2016). Critical diversity scholars in particular have analysed the shift in focus from the social justice of equal opportunities under liberal governmentality to one driven by business needs under the economic rationale of neo-liberalism (Ahonen et al., 2014; Johansson and Ringblom, 2017; Rottenberg, 2014), ushering in a means-end approach that treats women as little more than commodities. I explore this thinking more fully when I highlight the identity thinking that underpins the business case in Chapter Three, but for now I review the main concepts that critical diversity studies scholars have drawn on in order to problematise and analyse it, starting with injustice and power.

a) Injustice, power and instrumental reason

Critical theory tells us that injustice is not simply a matter of unequal power relations that result in oppression but is also a form of senseless suffering rooted in

the particular types of institutions and norms that the social relations of a given society engender (Horkheimer, 2002). In other words, injustice does not manifest itself simply in terms of the unequal distribution of power such as inequalities based on gender, class, ethnicity, or culture; but also by virtue of the social practices, structures and institutions through which power is generated, reproduced and embedded (Azmanova, 2012; Holck et al., 2016; Johansson and Ringblom, 2017). It is therefore problematic when the concept of organisational justice is rendered "servile to managerial prerogative" (Rhodes, 2016: 452) not least because it undermines the very meaning of the term (Dahanayake et al., 2018) and results in a discourse that denies the legitimacy or value of social justice arguments (Johansson and Ringblom, 2017; Noon, 2007).

From now on, therefore, instead of asking what could be done to tackle the social injustice of employment discrimination, organisations could simply ask how workforce diversity could contribute to corporate goals (Kirton and Greene, 2010). In essence, the business case has turned into a tool for symbolic domination in which those with power attempt to extend that domination by reducing employee diversity to the individual level, whilst at the same time trying to strip themselves of as many ethical and legal obligations as possible (Tatli, 2011). As such, the business case has been critiqued as little more than an instrument that uses diversity as an economic resource (Lorbiecki and Jack, 2000; Zanoni and Janssens, 2015); a sort of means-end relationship where managing diversity is the means and the attainment of organisational goals is the desired end (Lorbiecki and Jack, 2000).

Critical diversity scholars argue that these so called "rational" ways of thinking (Lorbiecki and Jack, 2000: 25) reflect the controlling nature of diversity management in which management is positioned as the subject. Diversity, on the other hand, is

the object or the "other" (Christensen and Muhr, 2018: 130) which has to be managed (Holck et al., 2016; Lorbiecki and Jack, 2000). Although diversity supposedly includes everyone, the properties of diversity are actually found solely among the managed (Lorbiecki and Jack, 2000). This utilitarian approach (Brewis, 2017) also dovetails neatly with the technical rationality mode of reasoning that is so prevalent in contemporary organisations in which they express their "indifference to difference" (Knights et al., 2015: 209) except where it can be managed as a form of diversity to facilitate a better match with their customer base or to improve their profitability. In effect, the ideal of gender equality has been subsumed by neo-liberal capitalism within the instrumental and individualistic discourse of the business case (Asirvatham and Humphries, 2019).

b) Individuals and group-based membership

This shift in approach works in parallel with another process whereby the diversity discourse (which emphasises the uniqueness of the individual) is mobilised alongside an ethos of group-based structural disadvantage (Johns and Green, 2009; Mease and Collins, 2018; Ozbilgin and Tatli, 2011). For instance, Romani et al (2019) reported that HR professionals portrayed the subjects of the company's diversity initiatives not as individuals but as members of a group with essentialist features. Likewise, Dennissen et al (2018b) found that most members who signed up to single identity diversity networks at their place of work took for granted the categorical basis on which they were organised, thereby normalising the idea of separate categories. As they point out, not only did this "single category" structure "obscure" unmarked categories of privilege, it also reinforced the essentialist nature of the so-called "disadvantaged categories" (Dennissen et al., 2018b: 18). Mikkelsen and Wåhlin (2019: 10) reported the same phenomenon in their case study of a large

retail organisation which managed diversity by "neutralising individual difference so that only individuals with the 'right type' of attitude were hired".

This approach is not new, however. For instance, Tatli (2011) found that, whatever the discourse to the contrary about the unique individual, group-based differences and legal compliance issues were driving organisational policies. The key issue, therefore, was not the actual practice but the ideological representation of those practices in the management of diversity discourses (Tatli, 2011). Zanoni and Janssens (2004) identified a similar phenomenon when interviewing Belgian HR managers employed by a major employer organisation. Although the managers usually started off the interview by listing the different sociodemographic characteristics of a hypothetical individual employee, this diverse employee was increasingly deconstructed as an individual in favour of their group membership as the discussion advanced. My own findings (discussed in Chapter Five) demonstrate that very little has changed in that diversity practices and programmes aimed at empowering women are overwhelmingly predicated on the concept of group membership. As such, although diversity is ostensibly based on individual difference, managers tend to focus on the groups under which they categorise those individuals, an approach that supports the myth of sovereignty of the individual employee in the sense that it offers an "illusion of variety and choice" but within a largely standardized "menu" (Korczynski and Ott, 2016: 913).

c) **Sameness in relation to difference and inclusion**

Mainstream diversity approaches also allege that the managing diversity perspective has an advantage over equal opportunities because of its emphasis on difference as opposed to sameness (Köllen et al., 2018; Ozbilgin and Tatli, 2011). Critical diversity scholarship, on the other hand, challenges the view of difference

being at the core of organisational diversity discourse (Ahonen et al., 2014), not least because as Christensen and Muhr (2018: 126) point out, if women's differences "become alike" then women as a group must be the same. In this way, then, diversity can signify both difference and sameness simultaneously (Christensen and Muhr, 2018), although this presumably depends on how diversity is defined. The problem is that if it is understood to mean "all the ways in which we differ" (Tatli, 2011: 247) or if it simply cannot be defined because it represents nothing more than a "psychoanalytical lack" (Christensen and Muhr, 2018: 122), it becomes a fairly meaningless concept. Conversely, as discussed in Chapter Five, if difference is interpreted within organisational discourse as group difference, it not only contradicts the concept of the ubiquitous unique individual, it also constitutes a form of identity thinking which can, in turn, be critically evaluated with reference to Adorno's theory of negative dialectics.

The discourse of diversity also rather begs the question as to whether there is an organisational mainstream against which differences can be measured (Dobusch, 2014). As such, it seems to assume that it is easy not only to decide who is a member of any given group, but also that to be a member of a group requires certain membership qualities (Dzubinski and Diehl, 2018; Zanoni and Janssens, 2004). This tendency for organisations to categorise members on the basis of their essential qualities also reveals who is considered to be different from the norm and therefore seen as somehow lacking or incomplete (Christensen and Muhr, 2018; Dennissen et al., 2018a; Merilainen et al., 2009).

Although everyone is said to be different within the diversity discourse (Lorbiecki and Jack, 2000; Mease and Collins, 2018), research has found that comparisons are not drawn equally between groups but between the most

advantaged group of white, heterosexual, abled men and all other groups (Humbert et al., 2018; Zanoni et al., 2010). This finding reinforces Acker's view that the supposedly "disembodied", "gender neutral" worker (Acker, 1990: 139) assumed within neo-liberal thinking is, in fact, a man. It also reinforces the idea that there are essential differences between men and women (Dzubinski and Diehl, 2018), thereby allowing the dominant to participate without feeling threatened (Humbert et al., 2018). Finally, by failing to tie diversity down as a concept, organisations can use it to block action and thus reproduce rather than challenge social privilege (Ahmed, 2007) by virtue of a process which underpins Adorno's critique of identity thinking, as I now consider.

d) Classification, categorisation and essentialism

Although humans have always classified and categorised objects in order to make sense of the world, the actual concept of essentialism originated in the work of Plato, for whom phenomena of the natural world were a reflection of a finite number of fixed and unchanging forms (DeLamater and Shibley Hyde, 1998). As essentialism implies the belief that "things have essential properties … that are necessary to those things being what they are" (Stone, 2004a: 138) it has been defined as a belief in a true essence (Dzubinski and Diehl, 2018; Humbert et al., 2018), something which is unchanging and therefore constitutive of a person or thing (Fuss, 1989). In other words, it is a belief that things or people have certain essential properties or qualities (Dzubinski and Diehl, 2018; Stone, 2004a). The dominance of this view was reinforced by the scientific revolution and the Enlightenment of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries when a belief in the existence of universal laws came to dominate the physical sciences (Litvin, 1997).

At the time, it also seemed reasonable to students of the organic world to assume that the same laws and classification systems could apply to the natural world of plants and animals. Indeed, despite the diversity of living things being brought back to the west by explorers and the subsequent finding that no two specimens were ever completely alike, taxonomy and classification became an "obsession" (Litvin, 1997: 191). This determination to "bind, order and classify the world and its people" (Lorbiecki and Jack, 2000: 25) and organise ourselves hierarchically constitutes the backbone of Adorno's critique of identity thinking. It is perhaps not surprising, therefore, that the importation of the concept of bio-diversity and the process of taxonomy to which it was subject into the contemporary workplace has resulted in the portrayal of individual, employee difference as little more than a matter of category membership as a result of this emphasis on stereotypes (Litvin, 1997; Mease and Collins, 2018). Indeed, Tatli (2011) has argued that the individual-based conception of difference is even more essentialist than the group-based conception as it is presented as a quality inherent within individuals, thereby concealing its socially constructed nature.

Although the ordering of individuals into a hierarchical taxonomy of humanity is often presented as obvious, natural and objective, it is far from obvious who or what constitutes a woman, as historical debates within feminism have highlighted (Butler, 1986; de Beauvoir, 2011; Gilligan, 2003; Oakley, 1972; Rubin, 1975) and which I consider in more detail in Chapter Three. Suffice to say here that these debates have focused on the issue of whether there are any shared characteristics that women must have in order to be a woman, or whether essentialism is simply an attempt to "read off the contingencies of social arrangements from the necessities of biology" (Stone, 2004a: 139).

e) Essentialism and binary thinking

It is also important to note that essentialism is a form of binary thinking (nature versus nurture; male versus female; sex versus gender) that is indicative of Western oppositional thought, particularly the Cartesian mind-body dualism (Knights and Clarke, 2017; Pullen and Rhodes, 2015). This in turn has impacted on the sex-gender dualism under which the bodily capacity of each sex is considered to be fixed (Gatens, 2002; Knights et al., 2015). Although these distinctions are not necessarily problematic in and of themselves, two main issues emerge when they become reified in the sense of becoming absolute and unchanging (Knights et al., 2015). Firstly they set up concepts in opposition to one another; and secondly they suggest the presence of a hierarchy resulting from the struggle for predominance between the binaries (Carr, 2000; Romani et al., 2019). As such, instead of recognising an increasing multiplicity and fluidity (Linstead and Pullen, 2006; Priola et al., 2018), one term has to be repressed at the expense of the other, thereby reinforcing power structures whether hidden or otherwise (Ghorashi and Sabelis, 2013). As women have historically been associated with nature and emotion, it is therefore natural for women to be subordinate to men according to the logic of Cartesian rationality (Knights et al., 2015), a concept that feeds directly into the essentialism of the diversity management discourse whereby women are positioned as the "other" and denied the status of a subject.

Nor can binary thinking be avoided by adopting the view that there is only one gender. For instance, although Wittig (drawing on de Beauvoir) argued that there is only one gender (feminine) as "the masculine is not the masculine but the general" (Wittig, 1983: 64) which men have appropriated for themselves (Wittig, 1985), her logic led her to assert that what makes a woman is her "specific social relation to a

man" (Wittig, 1993: 108), thereby perpetuating the dualistic hierarchy she was trying to avoid. Having said that, however, Wittig's argument is borne out to the extent that, as objects, only women have gender within organisational diversity discourse which I discuss further in Chapters Five and Six.

Similar problems apply to arguments that there is only one sex. Indeed, the idea that there was only one "male-centred" sex (Laqueur, 1990: 97) prevailed up until the eighteenth century. Under this one-body model, the male was considered to be the primary form while women were seen as imperfect men because their genitals were inside rather than outside the body (King, 2016). It has been argued that this emphasis on the similarities between men and women was inextricably linked with patriarchal thinking, reflecting the values of a male public world in which "man is the measure of all things, and woman does not exist as an ontologically distinct category" (Laqueur, 1990: 62).

It was only when the one-sex model disappeared that female genitals were given their own scientific denomination (Vandermassen, 2005) and the concept of the two-sex model finally took hold. However, as Fuss (1989) points out, these constructions of sex in terms of domination and subordination also smack of essentialism. As such, both the one sex and the two-sex model tend to reinforce Muhr's observation (2011: 349) that "despite a series of attempts to escape the essentialism underlying binary thinking, essentialism always seems to manage to find its way back". That is not to say that essentialism is inherently bad, rather that we need to be aware of its limitations.

From binary thinking to fluidity: trans and queer theory

Equally it does not mean that dualism and/or binary thinking have no role to play in understanding and analysing gender, as indicated in Chapter One. Indeed,

Fournier and Smith (2006: 160) suggest that it can be used intermittently as an analytical and political device to challenge gender oppression and facilitate a different understanding of fluidity such that it becomes possible "to move in and out of gender, rather than between gender identities". Linstead and Pullen (2006: 1288), on the other hand, argue that it is necessary to move away from the "binary heuristic" altogether in order to develop a new ontology of becoming and explore the politics of difference through the employment of ideas such as multiplicity and fluidity. Likewise, Muhr (2011: 349) suggests that scholars should start "thinking in terms of "multiplicity" or "excess". In other words, rather than categorising humans into binary groups of men and women with different labels of essentialist, identitarian characteristics, we should instead try to conceive of a person who can be both excessively female and excessively male at the same time (Muhr, 2011). In the next section I consider this call to go beyond the binary in three ways - by adding gender categories, by disrupting gender through queer theory and by exploring the concept of becoming-woman.

a) Undoing binary thinking by adding terms

Despite the dominant belief in the west that there are only two sexes and two genders, there is a "dizzying fluidity" (Lorber, 2011: 60) of bodies in the form of intersex, hermaphrodites, pseudo-hermaphrodites, transsexuals, transvestites and bisexuals. For instance, approximately 1.7% to 4% of people are estimated to have intersex variations (Jones, 2018). Trans activists, in particular, have argued that the concepts of gender and woman should be expanded, as explained in Chapter One. Indeed, there are a number of non-western societies that have third and fourth genders linking genitalia, sexual orientation and gender status in very different ways to the west (Godman, 2018; Linstead and Pullen, 2006). For instance, male

berdaches who adopt women's dress and do women's work have been reported in numerous native North American societies (Godman, 2018; Linstead and Pullen, 2006). Likewise, the Muxes of Juchita in Mexico are biological males who dress in traditional female attire but who are not generally interested in being understood as either transgender or as women (Mirandé, 2016). Contrary to western discourse, both groups are not only accepted as members but are fully integrated into their communities as third sex/gender categories (Godman, 2018; Linstead and Pullen, 2006; Mirandé, 2016).

The question, however, is whether the problems posed by binary thinking can be resolved by adding extra gender terms, such as adopting an LGBTQ+ discourse. Grosz (2006: 6) is unconvinced, arguing that there is no evidence that "three or four terms would somehow overcome the constraint of the two". Indeed, the example of male and female berdaches and Muxes supports her point in the sense that they are still defined in terms of male and/or female. Instead she suggests that difference can only be created through more variation or differentiation rather than the union of the two sexes through the creation of a universal term (Grosz, 2006).

Likewise it is questionable whether trans individuals have managed to challenge the binary structure of sex and gender by engaging in "gender crossing", (Westbrook and Schilt, 2014: 53) or whether they have simply developed a new model of sex and gender based on different criteria to the old one. For instance if a man with a penis self-identifies as a woman and a woman with a vagina self-identifies as a man, can it be said that the binary divide has been deconstructed or simply crossed over? Equally, however, it is important to acknowledge that not everyone in the transgender community wants to pass as a member of the opposite sex. Although some want to cross as a man or a woman, others reject these gender

categories, identifying instead as non-binary (Darwin, 2017; Garrison, 2018).

Interestingly, however, Garrison (2018) found that the trans individuals who

identified as non-binary in his study were more likely to endorse binary gender

distinctions compared to those who adopted a binary identity. Given these problems,

other scholars have suggested turning to queer theory in order to try to move away

from binary thinking and towards greater gender fluidity (McDonald, 2016).

b) Queer theory as disruptive of binaries

Although there is no definition of "queer" as such, the interpretation of it as

"whatever is at odds with the normal, the legitimate, the dominant" (Halperin, 1995:

62) suggests at the very least an interest in the radical deconstruction of the binaries

of masculinity/femininity, male/female and heterosexual/homosexual (McDonald,

2016; Rumens et al., 2019). It therefore seeks to challenge and break apart

conventional categories that essentialise sexuality and gender within binaries by

working at the site of ontology (Rumens, 2017). Indeed, according to Parker (2001:

38), "queering theory is … an attitude of unceasing disruptiveness". For instance,

when considering the "spatiality" of orientation, Ahmed (2006: 66) compares the

"normative dimension" to a body that appears "in line" by which she means their

alignment with other lines, compared with things that have come out of line. When

that happens, the "general effect" is "wonky" or even "queer" (Ahmed, 2006: 66).

Although it questions the essentialist nature of binary categories such as

heterosexual and homosexual, however, that is not to say that queer theory is

"against everyone and everything" (Rumens and Tyler, 2015: 451). Instead the key

advantage to queering is that it questions the boundaries of what lies on one side as

opposed to the other, rather than demonising what is in and celebrating what is out

(Parker, 2001). Although we are always bound by current conceptions of sexuality in

the sense that the dominant discourse tends to set the "frames" (Parker, 2001: 45) with which and within which we think, we are never entirely inside them either. As such, queer theory might usefully be applied to unsettle the binary ontology of heterosexuality, thereby forcing us to question what is supposedly normal in everyday life (Rumens et al., 2019).

This interest in disrupting categories – particularly those of sex, gender and sexuality – lie at the heart of Butler's thesis of the "heterosexual matrix" (Butler, 1990a: 151) in which she challenges the assumption that bodies can only make sense if "a stable sex [is] expressed through a stable gender (masculine expresses male, feminine expresses female) that is oppositionally and hierarchically defined through the compulsory practice of heterosexuality" (Butler, 1990a: 151). She argues instead that once we dispense with the fiction of an ordered gender ontology, then it becomes apparent that there is no "gender identity behind the expression of gender; that identity is performatively constituted by the very "expressions" that are said to be its results" (Butler, 1990a: 25). Assuming that leadership is also embedded within the same concept of the heterosexual matrix, it follows that a female leader should perform according to female values and a male leader with male values, in order to avoid transgressing normative values (Gipson et al., 2017; Muhr and Sullivan, 2013). According to Butler (1990a: 137), this gendered ontology can be deconstructed through cultural practices such as drag in which the drag artists play on the distinction between their anatomy and the gender that they are performing to reveal "the imitative structure of gender itself". In that way, instead of a heterosexual coherence, the audience is able to watch the denaturalisation of sex and gender, highlighting how the unity of these concepts is fabricated by means of a cultural construction (Butler, 1993).

However, although the binary may be subverted in drag performances, it still remains. In other words, although there has been a realignment on either side of the binary, there has not necessarily been a realignment across it (Linstead and Pullen, 2006). In that vein, Butler's drag metaphor can be criticised for potentially falling into the trap of binary thinking in the sense that the subversive effects that she describes depend on the contrast between male bodies and feminine clothes and behaviour which often draw heavily on gender stereotypes, thus reinforcing the idea of what it means to be a man or a woman (Morgenroth and Ryan, 2018). Although bi-sexuality (where the binary is crossed and re-crossed) may offer a more subversive third category in the sense that it constitutes a possible opening or a way in for a new paradigm to become visible, it could also be argued that it preserves the binary structure (Flanders, 2017; Linstead and Pullen, 2006) when it is understood as meaning the "separateness of the sexes" (Deleuze and Guattari, 2003: 276).

Likewise, as mentioned above, although transvestites and trans individuals can be said to occupy a terrain between and beyond male and female gender roles and identities (Thanem and Wallenberg, 2016), they do not necessarily challenge established gender categories. In particular, if the transition to another sex is permanent, the danger is that people may simply shift their expectations of that person to coincide with their new identity (Holck et al., 2016). Indeed, it could be argued that the increasing trend towards assimilation of gay and lesbian sexualities has reached the point whereby the "opportunities for queer to disrupt, destabilize and enable individuals to think the unthinkable are constrained" (Rumens and Tyler, 2016: 229). As such, they are fast becoming just another category within organisational discourse which is ripe for "pigeonholing and ghettoising" (Litvin, 1997: 205).

c) Becoming-woman and other differences

So if queer theory is constrained in the way that Rumens (2016) indicates and binary thinking cannot be resolved through the addition of extra terms or models (Godman, 2018; Grosz, 2006), then perhaps the epistemological category of "becoming-woman" developed by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari can offer a more non-identitarian way of understanding difference. Their concept of becoming, which they refer to as a verb "with a consistency all its own" (Deleuze and Guattari, 2003: 239), relates to "the elaboration of a difference within a thing" (Grosz, 2006: 4). As such, it was key to their aim of thinking differently about the sexes that men and women should only be understood in terms of their "becoming" (Deleuze and Guattari, 2003: 275). As "becoming" and "multiplicity" are the same thing (Deleuze and Guattari, 2003: 249), they were interested in the number of dimensions that any "multiplicity" could have (Deleuze and Guattari, 2003: 249). So although difference had come to be understood as the comparison of one thing with another (dualistic or binary thinking), they argued that underlying that dualistic structure was a "movement of differentiation" that elaborated a "multiplicity of things" (Grosz, 2006: 6). It was this concept of ceaseless motion that led them, in turn, to represent the concept of becoming in the form of a rhizome or non-hierarchical network (Linstead and Pullen, 2006). The root or branch metaphor of the rhizome – which is defined by connectivity but without a fixed order of things – could potentially therefore be used to avoid thinking in terms of hierarchies, enabling us to have multiple rather than unitary identities (Gherardi, 2019; Linstead and Pullen, 2006), particularly as the end goal of the rhizome "is not gender identity but gender imperceptibility – a gender dynamics that is both subjective and corporeal and yet beyond binary opposition and dialectics" (Linstead and Pullen, 2006: 1293). As such, the concept of

becoming-woman allows subjectivity to flourish so that it can be questioned along with otherness and dualistic ways of thinking and being (Pullen et al., 2017).

Deleuze and Guattari were not, however, interested in overcoming differences between the two sexes, but rather in the generation of more and more variations or differentiation between them. In other words their object was the "proliferation of dualisms" (Grosz, 2006: 6) rather than the undoing of binary terms. Indeed, they argue that the two sexes imply a "multiplicity of molecular combinations bringing into play … the man in the woman and the woman in the man" (Deleuze and Guattari, 2003: 213). Their project to challenge binary logic(s) by exploring the notion of internal difference through a concept of multiplicity and becoming was not, therefore, related to the binary structures that feminists have analysed as oppressive but rather to all structures as a whole. In other words, for Deleuze and Guattari "all becomings are equal" in the search for a subjectivity beyond gender (Braidotti, 2003: 49).

The problem with that approach, however, is that sexual difference cannot be treated as just one difference among many, not least because it misses the central point – that there is no symmetry between the sexes (Braidotti, 1994; Braidotti, 2003). Instead it has to be considered as a fundamental structural difference on which all others rest (Braidotti, 2003). So although the concept of "becoming-woman" challenges binary logic (Pullen et al., 2017), the concept of internal difference on which it is constructed lacks a consideration of existing power structures and overlooks the dialectical concept of the "difference of the Same" (Hamilton, 2013: 13).

In addition, although masculinities and femininities can be seen as multiple, multiplicity may also leave the binary divide in place such that these multiple

masculinities and femininities end up in a dualistic relation to each other, thereby reinforcing identitarian thinking. Given the hierarchical nature of the gender binary, the feminine is once again rendered subordinate to the masculine (Linstead and Brewis, 2004). As a result, by overlooking the "difference of the Same" (Hamilton, 2013: 13), Deleuze and Guattari underestimate the political obstacles facing women. That is not to say that difference is not a valid point of inquiry but rather that by locating freedom in the "internal cause" (Nesbitt, 2005: 93), they replace morality with an ethos that living in accordance with one's own nature can somehow bring about the good life. As Adorno pointed out, however, freedom for one individual in the context of unfreedom of another constitutes a form of delusion (Adorno, 1973). Indeed, Nesbitt (2005) argues that, by virtue of focusing on internal difference, Deleuze and Guattari end up purging negative dialectical contradiction, such that they endorse pure, identitarian thinking.

Conclusion

In this literature review chapter, located within feminist poststructural organisation studies, I first focused on the ways in which gender has been understood as an individual attribute within the women in management literature. Despite an initial commitment to an emancipatory perspective based on the critical theory of the Frankfurt School, CMS scholarship turned its focus towards concepts of "micro-emancipation" (Alvesson and Willmott, 1992b) and critical performativity which tended to overlook the role of gender within organisations. While critical organisation studies scholars drew on Adorno, they focused on aspects of his aesthetic theory rather than his critique of identity thinking. Likewise, although feminist poststructural organisation studies scholars put gender at the core of their scholarship, understanding it as a process rather than an attribute, they did not

explicitly draw on Adorno's critique of identity thinking. By focusing on these bodies of literature, I was able to show that, although these different disciplines have mobilized various aspects of Adorno's wide body of philosophical writings, they have overlooked the possibilities offered by his critique of identity thinking and his theory of negative dialectics with regard to an analysis of the concepts of sex and gender within diversity discourse. As such, my study is situated in such a way that it revitalizes the connection which existed between the original emancipatory aims of CMS and the critical theories of feminist organisational scholarship.

In terms of a critical analysis of the discourse of diversity management, I turned to critical diversity studies, focusing on the ways in which CDS scholars have analysed the shift from social justice underpinning equal opportunities to the economic rationality that lies at the heart of the business case. I also highlighted the superficial nature of the commitment by organisations to the uniqueness of the individual within the diversity discourse. Finally I noted the essentialist nature of organisational diversity discourse which focuses on group categorisation, despite being predicated on the notion that everyone is different. CDS scholars have also analysed essentialism as a form of binary thinking involving a hierarchy, thereby reducing the "feminine" to the role of "the wholly subordinate Other" (Knights and Kerfoot, 2004: 431). This emphasis on binary thinking led me to consider potential alternatives, such as queer theory and the category of "becoming-woman" (Pullen and Rhodes, 2015; Pullen et al., 2017). However, by asserting that all "becomings" are equal (Braidotti, 2003: 49), Deleuze and Guattari (2003) failed to take existing power structures into account, thereby underestimating the problems facing women.

Given these shortcomings, I turn in the next chapter to a consideration of Adorno's critique of identity thinking and his theory of non-identity thinking. I explore

the extent to which his approach can both complement and develop the ways in which feminist poststructural organisational scholars have analysed the role of gendered subjectivity. As such, I acknowledge the connections between the two bodies of literature, but also their theoretical distinctiveness particularly in relation to their understanding of the subject. I then explore the links that can be highlighted between his approach and the ways in which the CDS literature has problematised organisational diversity discourse, in particular the business case for diversity.

To that end, I consider how identity thinking can account for and explain the origins of the discourse of natural differences and the widespread assumption within organisational life that sex and gender are binary concepts. Thirdly, I explore the ways in which Adorno's theory of negative dialectics connects with de Beauvoir's understanding of woman as "situation" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 750) and Butler's theory of performativity (Butler, 1990b). Finally I highlight the ways in which Adorno can contribute to feminist identity politics in general by developing a dialectical understanding of what it means to be a gendered, organisational subject.

Chapter Three

Categorical thinking, negative dialectics and inequality

Introduction

In Chapter Two, I undertook a literature review situated in feminist organisational literature, reaching out to CMS and CDS. In order to put these studies in context, I firstly explored the ways in which women were framed within the women in management literature. Secondly, I considered the ways in which CMS scholars have drawn on a number of different aspects of Adorno's philosophical writings, but which have generally overlooked his critique of identity thinking and theory of negative dialectics. Thirdly, I provided an overview of feminist poststructuralist organisation studies scholarship, which focuses in particular on the ways in which discourse structures subjectivities but which has also overlooked Adorno's critique of identity thinking. Finally, I provided an overview of the main concepts explored by critical diversity scholars, particularly in relation to binary thinking and the essentialism bound up within that thinking. Following that discussion, I considered how a more fluid, less binary, approach such as that offered by queer theory might help to break down the categorical thinking that is so prevalent within organisational discourse.

Whilst acknowledging the contribution of these different strands of literature, particularly with regard to the ways in which they question organisational subjectivities and binary thinking, I suggest in this chapter that Adorno's critique of identity thinking can help scholars to further address these issues by shifting attention away from subjectivistic, binary thought and onto the identitarianism that lies behind it, thereby providing a more abstract framework with which to analyse it. Finally, I suggest that his theory of non-identity thinking, specifically his focus on the

concept of difference or the "remainder" (Adorno, 1973: 5) offers the possibility of a potentially more reflexive, less categorical, mode of thought about what it means to be a gendered, organisational subject.

In this chapter, therefore, I explore in more detail the ways in which his theories can shed light on my central question. That is, why gendered occupational segmentation in the UK labour market persists despite a corporate discourse that consistently advocates greater gender diversity and inclusion. In effect, this is a chapter in two parts. The first explores some of the key concepts and themes in Adorno's philosophical work, such as identity thinking, exchange value, nature and history and the ways in which these can help to shed light on that central question. Whilst I acknowledge that this represents a relatively small section of his thinking in that he also wrote about aesthetic theory, the culture industry and reflections from damaged life (among other things), my point is that feminist poststructural organisation studies scholars have not thus far engaged with insights from his critique of identity thinking and his theory of non-identity thinking in relation to the concepts of sex and gender. Although I identify some of the ways in which Adorno's critique differs from feminist poststructural theory at this point, I consider these differences more fully when I carry out my data analysis in Chapter Six.

The second part of the chapter explores some of the ways in which Adorno's theory of non-identity thinking is reflected in and complemented by feminist critiques of sex and gender as articulated by two of its most influential theorists, Simone de Beauvoir and Judith Butler. I then go on to provide an overview of some of the ways in which other critical feminist thinkers have drawn on Adorno's ideas. By identifying some of the similarities between Adorno's concepts and those articulated within critical, feminist discourse, my intention is to show how negative dialectics can

contribute to the analysis of the concepts of sex and gender which have underpinned feminist thinking for the last 40 years. Before going on to explore how Adorno's theories complements but can also contribute to both feminist and poststructural organisation studies literature, however, it is important to briefly explain some of the philosophical ideas that influenced him.

Philosophical influences on Adorno: Hegel and Marx

Adorno's theory of negative dialectics was heavily influenced by a distinctive combination of Hegel's idealism and Marx's materialism. Kellner (1989) argues that the 1930s' radicals (including Adorno and his long-time collaborator Max Horkheimer) who developed critical theory within the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research (also known as the Frankfurt School) were particularly drawn to Hegel's dialectical method and the way in which it was developed by Marx into a philosophy of dialectical materialism. Although there may be some debate as to the ratio which should be attributed to each school of thought, there can be no disagreement about the commitment of the Frankfurt School to the principle of emancipatory, social change grounded from the standpoint - at least initially - of Marxism (Granter, 2014). Indeed, Horkheimer argued in his famous treatise on Traditional and Critical Theory that "the critical theory of society begins with the idea of the simple exchange of commodities and defines the idea with the help of relatively universal concepts" (Horkheimer, 2002: 226). As such, their view of history was determined by social activity and experience, as well as the role of the system of production in shaping that reality or experience whilst at the same time relying on Hegel's dialectical method (Kellner, 1989; Sherratt, 2004).

Adorno's views on Hegelian "positive" dialectics

Contrary to popular belief, dialectic for Hegel in relation to his philosophy of knowledge did not mean a triad of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis but rather a series of contradictory moments from which new contradictions emerge (Hegel, 1977). The concept of a triad was, in fact, imputed to Hegel by Marx in order to explain categories of economic movements (Mueller, 1958). The first stage of Hegel's contradictory moments set out in the *Phenomenology of Spirit* is consciousness in which the subject is aware of the object as something alien, something outside of itself; the second is self-consciousness when the opposite happens and consciousness turns back on itself; the third stage is when reason is ultimately realised with the unity of subject and object (Hegel, 1977). As every situation within this dialectical, historical process contains conflicting elements within itself, it breaks down and gives rise to a new harmonious situation in which those elements are resolved. That is, until the new situation throws up more conflicts, resulting in endless movement towards the goal of human freedom (Magee, 1987). As each step is a step towards that ultimate goal, the process of negativity ends for Hegel in reconciliation or, as Adorno describes it, in "positive dialectics" in which the "negation of negation is the positive, the affirmative" (Adorno, 2008: 14). Although Adorno was heavily influenced by Hegel's philosophy, his philosophical ambition of reconciliation contrasted with Adorno's own theory of negative dialectics (considered later in the chapter), in which he argued for the constant separation of differences as opposed to their ultimate reconciliation. Equally, it should be said that other theorists do not subscribe to this interpretation - Butler, for one, emphasises Hegelian negative (as opposed to positive) dialectics in *Subjects of Desire* (Butler, 1987a).

However, not only did Hegel believe that an awareness of the world of objects must imply an awareness of self, he also argued that self-consciousness must involve an awareness of becoming an object in the eyes of others, a concept that he narrated in terms of the lord/bondsman or master/slave dialectic (Hegel, 1977). Simone de Beauvoir (2011: 74) famously analysed this dialectic in *The Second Sex*, arguing that the "relationship of master to slave would apply far better to the relationship of man to woman" in which woman, although not necessarily man's slave, is "at least his vassal" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 9) rendering her the "Other" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 79). Whilst Hegel argued that master and slave depended on each other in a reciprocal arrangement, de Beauvoir pointed out that in the man/woman dialectic, the oppressor (man) always maintains his advantage – both biologically and economically – over the oppressed (woman) because of her involvement with nature. In other words, the encounter is non-reciprocal because it is already gendered. For de Beauvoir, therefore, the relationship between man and woman differs from that of master and slave because the slave can acquire "a mind of his own" (Hegel, 1977: 119) through his alienated existence, whereas woman aspires to the values promoted by men. The problem is that these values undermine women by virtue of their role of repeating life in different forms, although "women never pitted female values against male ones; it is men wanting to maintain masculine prerogatives who invented this division; they wanted to create a feminine domain – a rule of life, of immanence – only to lock woman in it" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 74).

As woman could be neither master nor slave in Hegel's eyes because she could not attain self-consciousness, she was rendered the eternal object, never the subject. As such, his dialectic could not, in de Beauvoir's view, explain the oppressed situation of women (de Beauvoir, 2011) and therefore answer the

rhetorical question as to "why woman is the other" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 44). Indeed, it could be argued that her analysis pre-empted negative dialectics in the sense that she understood not only that the outcome of dialectics is always a negation, but also that this negation forms the basis of a dialectical encounter between self and other. So although Hegel purported to present an historical account of the development of humanity, he actually provided a description of a male rather than a human world (Battersby, 1998; Mills, 1987). Given this problematic attitude to women, I am not therefore suggesting that Hegel is the most useful starting point for a feminist analysis of the oppression of women in the workplace (although Butler might disagree), simply that his analysis of consciousness and dialectics was hugely influential in terms of Adorno's development of his theory of negative dialectics.

Marx's dialectics of historical materialism

Although he adopted many of Hegel's concepts, Marx's reading of Hegel was a largely materialist one emphasising that history can only change dialectically; and that the dialectical process has, as its goal, the achievement of a conflict-free society (Magee, 1987). In other words, like Hegel, history for Marx was teleological. Again, like Hegel, he predicted an end point to history in the sense that he imagined that it would achieve its goal in its totality (Sherratt, 2002). However, while Hegel viewed this historical process as applying to a mental or spiritual realm which he called Geist, Marx argued that it was materialist in nature. Indeed, this materialist turn was a central idea in Marx's thought (Magee, 1987; Sherratt, 2002) and was reflected in his view of history as a part of natural history. As he himself wrote, it did not require "deep intuition to comprehend that man's ideas, views and conceptions, in one word, man's consciousness, changes with every change in the conditions of his material existence, in his social relation, and in his social life" (Marx and Engels,

1977: 236). He did not therefore begin with a process of consciousness but with human exploitation (Mills, 1987), leading him to argue that history was not driven by Mind or Geist but by human labour and the socio-economic conditions in which that labour took place. It follows that for Marx "[t]he first historical act [was] … the production of material life itself" (Marx, 1978: 75). Society can only therefore become rational at the point when the material conditions of society are fully and properly developed, meaning that any dialectical analysis must be grounded in the social relations of capitalist production, not in the movement of a single totalizing principle in the form of Geist (Mills, 1987).

However, whilst Marx developed a detailed analysis of the impact of capitalism on the working class, he did not address the "woman question" to any great extent except in relation to women's participation within the capitalist labour force (Rubin, 1975). As such he has, in the past, been accused of reducing gender struggle to class struggle (O'Brien, 1979). It follows that many Marxist analyses of women's oppression have focused on the question of their relationship to the economic system under capitalism (Hartmann, 1979). Indeed, Engels (1972: 30) ascribed the "world historic defeat of the female sex" to the development of private property. As women's enslavement had come about from being limited to private, domestic labour, Engels reasoned that the only way to emancipate women was by abolishing private property and ensuring their participation in the labour force (Engels, 1972). However, following feminist engagement with Marxist thinking, this analysis was criticised particularly in relation to its failure to explain the differential impact of capitalism on men and women, its inability to explain where those sexual divisions came from and its failure to address patriarchy (de Beauvoir, 2011; Hartmann and Markusen, 1980; Walby, 1988). For instance, Hartmann and

Markusen (1980) argued that, by analysing occupational segmentation in relation to patriarchy rather than capitalism, it became possible to reveal the ways in which women's subordinate place in the labour market was linked to the patriarchal demand that women's labour power should be mainly confined to the home. As such, they reasoned that occupational segmentation could not be addressed without addressing the wider issue of patriarchy and the demand for changes to the relations between men and women (Hartmann and Markusen, 1980).

It follows that if capital and private property did not cause the oppression of women as women, eradicating them would not result in the end of women's oppression (de Beauvoir, 2011; Hartmann and Markusen, 1980). So although Marxism could explain how particular occupational structures came about, it could not explain why women were subordinate to men and not the other way round (de Beauvoir, 2011; Hartmann and Markusen, 1980). As de Beauvoir (2011: 64) pointed out, "historical materialism takes for granted facts it should explain" rendering it both "superficial" and "contingent". The reason, she said, that it cannot provide solutions to the problems faced by women is because "they concern the whole man and not this abstraction, *Homo economicus"* (de Beauvoir, 2011: 64). In other words, as argued throughout this thesis, there is more to woman's subjugation than her economic inequality stemming from her biology. Rather it has to be explained in terms of her overall ontological "situation" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 750). It is, therefore, this wider inequality that Marxism needs to confront and interpret. As de Beauvoir said, the real question that needs to be asked is: "What is a woman?" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 5), a question that I suggest can best be analysed through the lens of negative dialectics.

Adorno's critical theory

Although Adorno was heavily influenced by Marx both in terms of his theory of historical materialism and his ideas about the importance of natural history (Buck-Morss, 1977; Cook, 2008), he disagreed with him in terms of the teleological nature of history and the concept of revolutionary praxis (Buck-Morss, 1977). Although he may not have disagreed explicitly with him about the oppression of women, I suggest in this chapter that Adorno's critical theory of negative dialectics can provide a much more comprehensive explanation for gender inequality than that articulated by Marx.

Critical theory as developed by Adorno is, therefore, much more than a Hegelianised version of Marxism (Jay, 1973). Indeed, following the spread of fascism in Europe and the purges in Stalinist Russia, Horkheimer and Adorno started to distance themselves from the Marxist theory of history and political economy in the 1940s to become more "philosophical" (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2002: xiii). They did so by focusing more on a critique of the domination of nature, instrumental reason and the dialectic of enlightenment (Kellner, 1989) allowing them to "explain why humanity, instead of entering a truly human state, is sinking into a new kind of barbarism" (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2002: xiv) in the form of fascism. That is not to say that Adorno ever shared Marx's view of the need for revolutionary social change - his philosophy never included a theory of political action - but rather that the historical configuration of national socialism, Stalinism and state capitalism prompted him to write (along with Horkheimer) the *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, a pessimistic analysis of the values of the Enlightenment and the Hegelian and Marxist rationalist, progressive views of history.

Although the Enlightenment dream was to bring about a rationally organised society free from myth, Horkheimer and Adorno found instead a society in which reason was in eclipse (Horkheimer, 2004), operating for the benefit of capital and which turned "against the thinking subject itself" (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2002: 20). For all its claims to have become rational, they argued that this increasingly administered society had regressed into its absolute opposite - myth - albeit a secularised myth that, dialectically, contained an instrumentally rational core (Granter, 2014). Despite having been written almost 75 years ago, this analysis is still highly relevant in that it very much reflects the modern, neo-liberal society and the diversity discourse that I explore through the lens of Adorno's critical theory to explain the persistence of gendered occupational segmentation in the UK labour market. I suggest in later chapters that Adorno's critique of identity thinking not only helps to analyse the binary thinking that underpins the essentialism that pervades organisational diversity discourse; but that his theory of negative dialectics can also progress the feminist sex/gender debate. However before going on to do that, it is necessary to explain briefly what Adorno meant by identity and non-identity thinking.

Identity thinking, categorisation and non-identity thinking

Identity thinking is a normal (and normative) process that human beings use to categorise objects, thereby simplifying a complex social world rather than dealing with each individual as a unique case (Carothers and Reis, 2013). For instance, it is often used to differentiate between men and women on the basis that they have different essential qualities to the extent that they have been portrayed as coming from different planets (Gray, 2002). Although Adorno accepted that "we cannot think without identifying. Any definition is identification" (Adorno, 1973: 149), he was also highly critical of this type of instrumentalist cognition which simply "says what

something comes under, what it exemplifies or represents, and what, accordingly, it is not itself" (Adorno, 1973: 149).

According to Adorno, identity thinking originated as a way of dominating nature as well as "human beings" (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2002: 2), the rationale being that if a reasoning subject can conceptually assimilate objects, it can dominate them (Stone, 2008). As identity thinking assumes we can know an object once all possible classifications of it have been made, concepts become purely classificatory; with the objects only illustrative as examples of the concept (Jarvis, 1998). It also assumes that the object has all the properties of its concept, with the result that identity thinking collapses the diverse characteristics that make the object unique into general definitions and systems of concepts (Neimark and Tinker, 1987). By understating its real complexity, the particular becomes buried under the universal such that it imposes "on the whole world an obligation to become identical, to become total" (Adorno, 1973: 146).

Far from being a helpful way of understanding the world, Adorno and Horkheimer argue that this need to categorise or classify is now so dominant that nature, stripped of its qualities, has become "the chaotic stuff of mere classification" (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2002: 6). Adorno does not argue that it is intrinsically irrational for humans to try to control nature; the problem is the type of hierarchical subjectivistic thinking that it produces (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2002). Working on the basis that an object is always "something other" than the subject (Adorno, 1973: 183), whereas a subject is by its very nature also an object, Adorno argued that things (objects) should have priority, not conceptual consciousness. That did not mean that he wanted the object to be placed on the "orphaned royal throne once

occupied by the subject" (Adorno, 1973: 181), but rather that he wanted to abolish the hierarchy altogether.

According to Carothers et al (2013), sex is one of the most readily observed human traits, so it is perhaps not surprising that it is also the most pervasive method of categorising people (even more so than race). Indeed, sex is possibly the strongest example of essentialism in lay social cognition because of a belief that sex differences are grounded in genetic explanations, giving them a "sense of naturalness" (Carothers and Reis, 2013: 386). That is not to say there is no value in the idea of natural groupings; the problem arises from the notion that we can infer behaviour from distinctions on the basis of biological sex (Howie, 2006). As Adorno and Horkheimer (2002: 182) point out, however, classification is no more than a "condition of knowledge, not knowledge itself; and knowledge in turn dissolves the classification".

Given that we cannot think without identifying, Adorno does not advocate discarding the "ideal of identity" (Adorno, 1973: 149). Rather, his view is that "identity can … become adequate to its concept by acknowledging its own moment of non-identity" (Dews, 1986: 39) through a process of critical reflexivity. As Dews (1986) explains, this is because there is no automatic antagonism between conceptual thought and reality; the problem lies in the assumption within identity thinking that the concept takes precedence leading to the delusion that the mind can comprehend the world in its totality, despite its failure to acknowledge the moment of non-identity. Adorno's main line of criticism is therefore aimed at the coercive attitude by which identity is forced onto the object and the retention of identity as the goal of conceptual thought (Adorno, 1973). As indicated previously, despite Adorno's criticisms of identity thinking, he recognises that it has value in that it offers

us a way of making sense of the world. This twin-track approach is also of value to feminists who are rightly critical of categorical thinking but who simultaneously continue to advocate the treatment of women as an oppressed group, as I explain in later chapters.

Instead Adorno argues that the "secret telos" (Adorno, 1973: 149) of cognition should be dialectical or non-identity thinking. Although this type of cognition also identifies "to a greater extent and in other ways" to identitarian thinking, the difference is that it "seeks to say what something is" (Adorno, 1973: 149). So rather than subsuming the object under its high-level concept, thereby erasing the particularity of objects and their unique traits (Cook, 2008), non-identity thought allows the dissonance between the concept and the object to be revealed (Rose, 1976). It is in this way that we can see that "objects do not go into their concepts without leaving a remainder" (Adorno, 1973: 5). Adorno accepts therefore that objects fall under concepts but argues that each object is also unique and it is that particular quality that constitutes its non-identical aspect (Stone, 2008). It follows that negative dialectics cannot "come to rest in itself, as if it were total" (Adorno, 1973: 406) because there is always something left over, something that remains. I draw on this concept of the "remainder" in some detail in later chapters to emphasise that, by failing to recognise that an object is always "something other" than its concept (Adorno, 1973: 183), corporate diversity discourse has equated the object of the body of woman with the concept of her sexed and gendered characteristics, thereby reducing her to a set of constructs.

I also consider in Chapter Six the ways in which Adorno's critical theory can highlight the identitarian nature of organisational diversity discourse. For now, however, I would just say that his insights highlight some of the ways in which it is

problematic. Firstly, contemporary corporate diversity discourse promotes the notion that women have a natural, biological essence; secondly it assumes that the concepts of sex and gender are the same as the object of the body such that the two equate to one another and nothing is left over; and thirdly it is highly instrumentalist in that it imposes (rather ironically, as will become clear in Chapter Six) "on the whole world an obligation to become identical" (Adorno, 1973: 146) through the increasingly dominant concept of exchange which I consider in the next section.

Exchange value and identity thinking

Given that the "particular rationality" (Adorno, 1973: 172) of identity thinking came about because of a fear of nature, this bondage of humans to nature is, in turn, perpetuated by a thinking that equalizes things that are unequal. As it is through exchange that "non-identical individuals … become commensurable and identical" (Adorno, 1973: 146) the exchange principle is fundamentally the same as the identification principle. However, because the more powerful party to the transaction always benefits more than the other party, it invariably runs counter to the ideal of "free and just barter" (Adorno, 1973: 147).

Not only is it an unequal exchange, it is also viewed as perfectly natural rather than having been imposed by a social law. This is because capitalist society is a totality in the sense that it is dominated by the mechanisms of interchange and exchange. As the domination of the exchange process has increased to the point where its control over society prevents the formation of independent consciousness, Adorno argues that "the reified consciousness has become total" (Adorno, 1973: 346). However, as barter transgresses its own principle as a process, it automatically creates a false consciousness (Adorno, 1973). Given this alienated

consciousness, individuals are prevented by an "individualistic veil" (Adorno, 1973:

312) from seeing the homogeneity imposed on them by reification, despite the

obvious disregard for living human beings brought about by the exchange process.

Whatever the claims of support in favour of greater gender diversity on the

part of corporations, the principle of equivalence provides a useful approach for

interrogating my findings in Chapters Five and Six. A good example is the business

case for diversity which is based on the notion of a means-end equation whereby

women have to provide added value to warrant appointment to a corporate board or

a senior management role. Although capitalism has always been underpinned by

the principle of equivalence, I draw on these ideas in Chapters Five and Six to

suggest that, because of the dominance of the discourse of neo-liberal capitalism

within contemporary society, instrumental reasoning has come to dominate not just

capitalism but also the concept of diversity management. Perhaps not surprisingly,

given that it emerged from neo-liberalism, much of postfeminism also adheres to an

instrumental pragmatic rationality in the sense that it is a mechanistic form of

thinking that tends to be unreflexive and goals-oriented in nature (Caputi, 2013).

That is not to say that having an interest in outcomes is always an indication of

instrumental reasoning (how else is success to be measured, after all) but rather

that it is unhelpful when it completely replaces thought and reflexion about women's

inequality.

Biology, nature and history

As already indicated, biological essentialism is not necessarily problematic, in

and of itself. Indeed, as Adorno makes clear, humans inevitably categorise people

into natural groupings in order to make sense of a complicated world. The problem

arises when we assume that there is an automatic connection between those

groupings and the socialised behaviour that each group demonstrates because of their physical difference to each other. I now revisit this issue by considering woman's identification with nature in the context of Adorno's inquiry into natural history.

Clearly, there has been much feminist debate around the sex/gender distinction which I consider later in the chapter (Butler, 1990a; Butler, 1993; de Beauvoir, 2011; Oakley, 1972; Rubin, 1975), so my aim at this point is simply to set out aspects of Adorno's dialectical perspective and the ways in which it relates to organisational diversity discourse. By definition, this must include, as Mills (1987) argues, an analysis of the unique role of women's biology. In order to address the "woman question", she suggests that it is therefore necessary to "understand and retain a dialectical analysis of the relation between nature and history" (Mills, 1987: 72).

This is, of course, not the only reason for women's inequality as de Beauvoir (2011) points out, but it is an important one. As already indicated, this relationship between women and nature is also reflected within organisational diversity discourse. In particular, it is manifested in the tendency of organisations to situate diversity discourse within a framework which, as the CDS literature showed, focuses on the "essence" of women (Litvin, 1997: 202) as manifested in their "special capacities" and "feminine capabilities" (Gremmen and Benschop, 2011: 180). Interestingly, it is never clear whether these references are to social/cultural or biological characteristics, such is the conflation between the natural and the social within diversity discourse. I would therefore suggest that Adorno's inquiry into natural history can reveal how this thinking is emblematic of a process whereby the

concept of second nature (the social) has become so reified that it is mistaken for the object of first nature (the body).

At issue for Adorno was the "historical relationship between what appears - nature - and its meaning ie transcience" (Adorno, 2006b: 263) in the sense that nature, as creation, carries the mark of transience. As it is transitory it includes the element of history. However, if all historical change was simply natural, then everything historical would get its meaning from something that was random (Whyman, 2016). In order to account for changes in meaning, Adorno therefore argued that everything existing has to be grasped as the breaking apart and "interweaving of historical and natural being" such that "the natural appears as a sign for history and history …. as a sign for nature" (Adorno, 1984: 121). By dialectically overcoming the usual antithesis between nature and history, Adorno's aim is to comprehend an object as natural where it appears most historical; and as historical where it appears most natural (Adorno, 1984).

In order to expose the historical dimension in something that seems natural, Adorno relies on the concept of "second nature", a reference to the false or mythical appearance of given reality as ahistorical, but which negates any nature that "might be conceived as the first" (Adorno, 1973: 357). This concept of second nature facilitates an understanding that we inhabit a world where the products of social action have become so reified that they have taken on the appearance of being natural. At the same time, these products also leave clues as to their true function (otherwise we could not recognise them for what they are). For Adorno, therefore, second nature represents a point where physical matter intersects with the production of meaning (Pensky, 2004).

The social law of exchange value (and capitalism more generally) is a good example of this so-called law of nature, whereby the social process of exchange has become so reified that equivalence in bourgeois society is now worshipped as an end in itself (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2002). It follows that the social constructs of sex and gender also appear as second nature when viewed as governed by natural laws; first nature, on the other hand, refers to biological or physical nature (Cook, 2006; Testa, 2007), a point considered more fully later in this chapter when I focus on the concepts of sex and gender from a feminist perspective and again in Chapter Six.

However, Adorno tells us that it is also important not to perceive first nature or the body as though it was in opposition to second nature. This is because, as mentioned earlier, the goal of negative dialectics is to abolish the hierarchy between subject and object in order to avoid a collapse into identity thinking which prioritises conceptual thought over the object. When Adorno made the point that "[i]t is by passing to the object's preponderance that dialectics is rendered materialistic" (Adorno, 1973: 192), he made clear at the same time that an object can only be known "as it entwines with subjectivity" (Adorno, 1973: 186), thereby avoiding the accusation of a subject/object binary (Battersby, 1998). In other words, the two enjoy a mutually constitutive relationship, such that neither of them can make sense in the absence of the other (Adorno, 1998). Indeed, Adorno says "[t]here is "no sensation without a somatic moment" (Adorno, 1973: 193). As such, the suffering body constitutes the site where we experience the failure of the imposed unity of subject and object (Yun Lee, 2005). For Adorno, therefore, there is an objective corporeal reality, but one which is marked by the tension between the substance of materiality and the movement of history (Yun Lee, 2005). Human pain and suffering

are real and it is this which tells us that "suffering ought not to be, that things should

be different" (Adorno, 1973: 203), particularly "after Auschwitz" (Adorno, 1973: 361).

Although the idea of the subject is based on the model of the living individual,

that individual is effectively powerless in Adorno's view of modern society,

amounting to little more than an appendage to the social machinery under which

they live (Molt, 2002). This powerlessness is, again, not total because otherwise it

could never be resisted. However, given women's greater bodily involvement with

reproduction (Ortner, 1972), they are seen as having less power than men. Indeed,

as "an embodiment of biological function, an image of nature" (Horkheimer and

Adorno, 2002: 206), woman does not even have the status of a subject, an

important point of focus for feminists. However, before I consider what feminists

such as de Beauvoir had to say about the "gendering of subjectivity" (Kruks, 1992:

95), I first briefly look at the ways in which the subject is theorised within feminist

poststructuralism and critical theory. This complements my literature review in

Chapter Three and provides further theoretical context for the discourse analysis

that I undertake of corporate diversity material in Chapter Five. By distinguishing

aspects of Adorno's critique from that of poststructuralism in this section, particularly

with regard to the subject, I start to set out his distinctive, theoretical contribution, a

process which I continue to articulate in Chapter Six and the Conclusion.

Theoretical distinctiveness of Adorno

In Chapter Two, I explored the ways in which feminist organisational

poststructuralists theorised the role of discursive practices in structuring gendered

organisational subject positions and, specifically, how people are made subject

through these practices (Calás and Smircich, 1996; Calás and Smircich, 2006).

Rejecting the notion that meaning derives from a connection between words and the

world to which they refer, poststructuralists argue instead that it derives from the relationship between sign and signified in the discursive formations of language (Hekman, 1992). As signs are only meaningful because they allow us to differentiate one thing from another, the priority of language is thereby established over conceptual thought. However, by emphasising the way in which subjects are constituted within discursive formations, poststructuralists have been criticised for presenting a subject which is wholly determined and lacking in agency (Hekman, 1992).

Although Adorno was also critical of the subject, he did not call for its abolition, not least because, for him, it operates as the agent of the object, as opposed to its constituent (Adorno, 1998), albeit one that is confined within the circle of its own immanence. As such, it has to be criticised "from outside" as well as inside so that the subject can "make up for what it has done to non-identity" (Adorno, 1973: 145). In other words, Adorno is critical of the subject because of its role in identity thinking and the assumption that it can know an object in its totality. However, because there is no automatic antagonism between conceptual thought and reality, Adorno argues that the "strength of the subject [can be used] to break through the fallacy of constitutive subjectivity" (Adorno, 1973: xx). It is therefore by limiting the power of the subject, rather than its obliteration, that it becomes possible to "put an end to its power" (Adorno, 1973: 183). Foucault, on the other hand, argues that because power is everywhere subjectivity has to be understood as the constitutive activity of power/knowledge rather than of consciousness (Gandesha, 1991). In this way, Adorno retains a concept of the subject (albeit a subject condemned to reification), while Foucault theorises the subject as a construct of

power and discourse (Dews, 1989), such that power is rendered a necessary (rather than contingent) condition of subjectivity (Gandesha, 1991).

Although Adorno has been criticised for remaining stuck in the paradigm of consciousness, this should not be taken to mean that he neglected a philosophy of language in favour of a philosophy of the concept (Pensky, 1997). On the contrary, he viewed language as a key element in the deconstruction of philosophical idealism, based on the premise that all philosophical critique stems from a critique of language (Gandesha, 2006). Contrary to poststructural theory, however, Adorno believed that because of the intersectional nature of natural-history, the word must also be the meeting point between language and material history (Pensky, 1997). As such, for Adorno, words can never be just signifiers for what can be conceptualised, but instead are filled with history. Although he was therefore aware of the embeddedness of philosophy in language and questioned the legitimacy of traditional philosophical discourse, Adorno did not want to sever semiotics from their semantic aspects, emphasising instead the need for concepts and categories to convey thought (Hohendahl, 1997). Indeed, unlike the poststructuralists, Adorno wanted to get to know the concept in order to ascertain whether it "does justice to what it covers and whether the particular fulfils its concept" (Adorno, 1973: 146).

Perhaps not surprisingly, these differences between critical theory and poststructuralism are also reflected within feminist theory. Theorists such as Seyla Benhabib (1995) defend a feminism rooted in critical theory, while other scholars such as Judith Butler focus on poststructuralist conceptions of subjectivity, identity and human agency (Fraser, 1995). Writing about the "uneasy alliance" between feminism and postmodernism as she called it, Benhabib (1995) argued, among other things, that by decentring the discursive subject, postmodernism undermined

the feminist commitment to women's agency and sense of selfhood. Indeed, even if

postmodernism could account for individual agency, she argued that its inherent

anti-essentialism would delegitimise the category of woman (Benhabib, 1995) and

surrender the "normative moment" (Canaday, 2003: 67). Although Butler agreed that

it was necessary to speak as and for women, she argued that "identity" as a

category is normative (not just descriptive) and therefore always exclusionary. It is

only by releasing the category of woman from a fixed referent that agency becomes

possible in the sense that it allows us to expand the possibility of what it means to

be a woman (Butler, 1995). Indeed, Butler (1995) argued that to claim that the

subject is constituted is not to suggest that it is determined as it is never fully

constituted by exclusion, but rather is subjected and produced time and time again.

Deconstructing the subject does not necessarily mean throwing away the subject,

therefore. Instead, it opens up the term to a "reusage or redefinition that previously

has not been authorised" (Butler, 1995: 49).

The problem, however, is that whatever the possibilities opened up by this

deconstructive approach, Butler is unable to explain how feminists can pursue a

liberatory or emancipatory politics if the group in question cannot be defined (Fraser,

1995). Benhabib, on the other hand, is unable to articulate a theoretical perspective

which rejects universalist norms whilst simultaneously retaining an interest in

emancipation (Fraser, 1995). It is my contention that Adorno can bridge the gap

between these two theoretical positions by virtue of the overtly emancipatory

framework underpinning his critique. Not only does Adorno not abandon the subject,

he makes clear that, at the heart of his philosophy, lies a non-essentialist agentic

subject, thereby addressing one of Benhabib's main concerns. By highlighting the

shortfall in conceptual thought, on the other hand, he is able to emphasise the

dissonance between the subject and the object. In this way, he allows for the possibility that the term "woman" means something other than we declare her to be, thereby answering the charge of essentialism directed at critical theorists like Benhabib by poststructuralists.

Feminism, Adorno and the sex/gender debate

So far in this chapter I have highlighted the ways in which identity thinking is predicated on classification and categorisation, leading to a tendency towards essentialism. I also focused on Adorno's inquiry into natural history and the ways in which materiality (first nature) has become conflated with the concepts of sex and gender (second nature). Having explained the central concepts of Adorno's critique on which I am focusing, I then provided a brief overview of how these can be distinguished from the main tenets that underpin poststructuralism. In this next section I explore some of the different ways in which Adorno's critical theory has been drawn on within feminist identity politics which I refer to as the sex/gender debate. By this I mean the discussion around the shifting meanings of sex and gender within feminist discourse and their inter-relationship with one another.

As explained in Chapter One, this debate has not just been pivotal to feminist politics since the 1960s but is also central to my overall research question as to why gendered occupational segmentation still persists. In this section of the chapter, therefore, I consider the ways in which Adorno's theory of non-identity thinking is reflected in the philosophical approaches of Simone de Beauvoir and Judith Butler by undertaking a brief critique of some of their major works. I then consider the ways in which other feminist critical thinkers have explicitly drawn on Adorno, underpinning my assertion that his theoretical approach can shift the parameters of

the debate by focusing on the thinking that lies behind the concepts of sex and gender, encouraging feminists to go behind the binary rather than beyond it.

The sex/gender debate has a long history. As mentioned in Chapter Two, up until the 1800s it was thought that there was only one "male-centred" sex (Laqueur, 1990: 97), in that men and women were thought to have the same parts which were differently arranged. Rather than constituting something distinct from men, therefore, female organs were simply viewed as less developed versions of male organs (Nicholson, 1994). During the period of the one-sex model the body was considered to be secondary while gender was primary or real (Laqueur, 1990). As such, sex before the eighteenth century was a sociological as opposed to an ontological category (Laqueur, 1990). With the shift to the two-sex model, the female body came to be understood as the "incommensurable opposite" (Laqueur, 1990: viii) of the male's and the idea that anatomy and biology were ideologically insignificant changed dramatically. Henceforth, scientific truth in the form of biological determinism was drafted in to keep women in their place (Moi, 1999).

It was not, however, until the 1960s that the English language distinction between sex and gender came into general use. First developed by psychiatrists and medical personnel working with intersexed and transsexual patients the terms were quickly appropriated by feminists (Moi, 1999). Once the body was taken to be meaningful it became possible to fight over how much or how little meaning it had, allowing gender to be "pictured as a barricade thrown up against the insidious pervasiveness of sex" (Moi, 1999: 15).

Although Simone de Beauvoir did not actually use the terms sex and gender in her major work *The Second Sex*, she has since been interpreted as underscoring a distinction between sex as biological fact, and gender as its cultural interpretation

(Butler, 1986) when she observed that rather than being born woman, we have to "become woman" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 283). This insight underpins her general argument that, as biology, psychoanalysis and historical materialism cannot explain woman's subordinate status, a different, more philosophical approach is required (Tyler, 2014) to account for her classification as the "Other" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 6). In effect, de Beauvoir's basic thesis was that "becoming" a man or a woman is a social process that is learnt (Tyler, 2014). As a result, she has generally been credited with providing feminists with the theoretical lever to argue for change by identifying that many of the constraints on women's becoming were the social expression of gender and not the effect of biological sex (Sandford, 2006).

Second wave feminists in the late 1960s and early 1970s developed this discourse into a dual-system, identitarian concept (Knapp, 1999) between sex as a biological term and gender as a psychological and cultural one, indicating the amount of masculinity or femininity in a person (Oakley, 1972; Rubin, 1975). At the same time, they emphasised the non-essentialism of gender compared to the essentialist "fixed star" of sex (Oakley and Mitchell, 1997: 48). Although feminists therefore accepted that men and women were different in terms of their physique and reproductive function, they argued that those differences should have no relevance to the opportunities open to them or the activities in which they should engage (Young, 2002).

In the 1970s and 1980s, however, some second-wave feminists began to stress the similarities among women and, by definition, their differences from men, focusing on biology (Firestone, 1979); mothering (Chodorow, 1978); reproduction (O'Brien, 1981); and/or psychology (Gilligan, 2003) falling into further, identitarian constructs (Becker-Schmidt, 1999). These sweeping generalisations about women's

nature (in other words, their essence) tended to reflect the perspectives of the white, heterosexual, middle-class women making them, leading to an outcry from women of colour, lesbians and working-class women that not all women are the same (hooks, 2014; Mohanty, 1984). Perhaps not surprisingly, therefore, some feminists in the 1980s started to abandon these attempts at grand social theory, along with the essentialist assumptions underpinning them (Fraser and Nicholson, 1990).

The problem was, however, that if subjects could not be categorised in terms of their gender categories and groups could not be classified by virtue of their biological commonalities, how could women be thought about, identified and represented in order to bring about social change (Hewitt, 2006)? Needless to say, this is not an easy question to answer, but I suggest that Adorno's critique of identity thinking and his theory of non-identity thinking, combined with the insights developed by de Beauvoir and Butler, can help. In the next section I therefore want to consider the extent to which some of the concepts underpinning Adorno's negative dialectics can be found in the philosophical work of Simone de Beauvoir before going on to focus on the insights of another ground-breaking feminist, Judith Butler.

Simone de Beauvoir: biology and woman's "situation"

In her book, *The Second Sex*, the French philosopher Simone de Beauvoir emphasised the importance of biology in terms of differentiating between men and women, arguing that it is "an irreducible and contingent fact" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 23) that "humanity is split into two categories of individuals with manifestly different clothes, faces, bodies" etc (de Beauvoir, 2011: 4). Writing at length on these differences, she pointed out that woman is clearly "weaker than man; she has less muscular strength, fewer red blood cells; a lesser respiratory capacity; she runs less

quickly, lifts less heavy weights", with the result that her individual life is "not as rich" as that of men (de Beauvoir, 2011: 46). These "weaknesses" rendered her the "prey to the species" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 75) to a much greater extent than man; with the added misfortune that she was biologically destined for the repetition of life as part of the "burdens of reproduction" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 72). Although it was Adorno and Horkheimer who wrote in the *Dialectic of Enlightenment* that as "woman is smaller and weaker" than man "an embodiment of biological function, an image of nature", she is not even a subject (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2002: 206), it could easily have been written by de Beauvoir.

Indeed, according to de Beauvoir, the key to the whole mystery of woman's subordination lies in the belief that because of her greater bodily involvement with the natural functions surrounding reproduction, she must be more closely involved with nature than man (Ortner, 1972). By contrast, men are identified not only with culture in the sense of human creativity, but culture in the old-fashioned sense of the finer and higher aspects of human thought (Ortner, 1972). As such, de Beauvoir (2011: 74) wrote that woman survives by repeating "the same Life in different forms" whereas man ensures the repetition of life while transcending life through existence. Transposed to an organisational context, the understanding that woman equals nature while man equals culture can be seen to perpetuate the notion that management is inherently a manly business (Heilman, 2001; Stoker et al., 2012).

Crucially, it is because of women's identification with nature that she also becomes the object through which man subjugates nature (de Beauvoir, 2011). This perspective seems to infer (as Adorno and Horkheimer also argue in the *Dialectic of Enlightenment*) that man does not simultaneously dominate both nature and woman and then conflate the two; but rather he dominates woman by directly identifying her

with nature (Hewitt, 2006). As "woman" is only seen as "a representative of her sex, and thus, wholly encompassed by male logic, she stands for nature. Woman as an allegedly natural being is a product of history, which denatures her" (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2002: 87). In other words, as woman has only come to be associated with nature through "male logic" (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2002: 87), she inevitably becomes "denatured" by the dialectical relationship between nature and history such that the socialised process of becoming woman has, over time, become so reified that it is now viewed as synonymous with nature (de Beauvoir, 2011). However, in a world in which the purpose of reason is to dominate nature "biological inferiority remains the ultimate stigma" (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2002: 206). It is no coincidence, therefore, that both de Beauvoir and Adorno emphasise the importance of the body (particularly one that suffers) and woman's identification with nature in order to explain the historical processes through which she has become an object who is subjugated by man.

Equally, however, although de Beauvoir (2011: 44) emphasises the "extreme importance" of the body in the sense that it provides "one of the keys that enable us to understand woman", she makes clear that it does not represent her destiny. Biological data, she writes, do not "constitute the basis for a sexual hierarchy; they do not explain why woman is the Other; they do not condemn her forever to this subjugated role" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 44). Instead, the facts of biology have to be viewed through the prism of their "ontological, economic, social and psychological contexts" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 48). In order to explain women's "limitations", therefore, it is women's "situation" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 750) that must be invoked as opposed to some mysterious biological essence.

By this, de Beauvoir meant societal influences which have a determinative impact on individuals. However, because these cultural possibilities appear to be part of the natural order they also appear difficult, if not impossible, to change. As such, "situation" can include the conditions into which we are born, the specific form of our embodiment and even our past (Sandford, 2006). The body is therefore a particular kind of situation on which experience of oneself and the world is founded, and therefore always enters one's lived experience. Lived experience, in turn, becomes part of one's situatedness (Moi, 1999). The body as a situation is therefore the "concrete body experienced as meaningful, and socially and historically situated" (Moi, 1999: 74). It is this understanding of the body "not [as] a thing" but as "a situation" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 46) that provides a powerful and sophisticated alternative to the concept of the sex/gender dichotomy (Moi, 1999). In particular, it avoids a scientific view of the body on which the component of gender is constructed by allowing woman to become a fully embodied human being who cannot be reduced to her differences, whether natural or cultural (Moi, 1999).

It also embraces a degree of ambiguity or non-identity in the sense that the concept of situation does not, nor could it ever, equate to the object of woman. It is, therefore, not surprising that Adorno and de Beauvoir agree that, dialectically, the "natural" and the "historical" body are not two separate entities but are instead "two dimensions of the same object: the human body is at the same time natural and historical" (Stoetzler, 2016: 349). This emphasis on the interweaving of nature and history also links Adorno and de Beauvoir with later critical theorists such as Judith Butler, whose theoretical approach I now consider in terms of further developing the sex/gender debate.

Judith Butler: normativity, performativity and the body

By conceiving of the body as both "perspective" and "situation," Butler credits de Beauvoir with revealing gender "as a scene of culturally sedimented meanings" such that "[t]o become a gender means both to submit to a cultural situation and to create one" (Butler, 1986: 48). Building on that understanding, Butler then suggests that if only the "situated body" replete with cultural interpretations can be found as opposed to the "pure body", de Beauvoir's theory seems implicitly to ask whether "sex was not gender all along" (Butler, 1986: 46). It follows that if sex is a gendered category then it no longer makes sense to define gender just as the cultural inscription of meaning on that pre-given sex, but rather as the apparatus whereby the sexes themselves are established (Butler, 1990a).

This view - that what appear to be natural differences can be traced to their cultural origins - was also echoed by Adorno when he wrote that the "feminine character" (Ziege, 2003: unnumbered) is the product of a masculine society which dominates woman by identifying her with nature. It follows therefore that "[w]hatever is in the context of bourgeois delusion called nature, is merely the scar of social mutilation" (Adorno, 2005: 95). Indeed, pre-empting Butler's insights in a letter to the German social psychologist Erich Fromm in 1937, Adorno proposed an idea to analyse the "feminine character" disputing the biological basis of femininity altogether, arguing instead that it had been "conditioned through her identification with man" (Ziege, 2003: unnumbered). Like Butler, therefore, Adorno believed that sex was no more biologically necessary than gender in order to explain the subordination of women (Duford, 2017). As such, he would seem to agree with her that both sex and gender are historical and therefore social constructs.

Butler then developed the argument further by offering the possibility that the so-called natural facts of sex are actually produced by various scientific discourses in the service of other political interests (Butler, 1990a). By assuming that the effects of biology are separate from those of socialisation, she suggests that society is able to use the dichotomy of sex and gender to enforce conformity and label "feminine men" and "masculine women" as deviants (Butler, 1990b: 279), thereby serving as an ideology of gender regulation and control. As such, the category of sex is normative, a "regulatory ideal" or practice that produces the bodies it governs (Butler, 1993: 1). Indeed, once sex is understood in terms of its "normativity", the materiality of the body cannot be thought about as being separate from the materialisation of that regulatory norm (Butler, 1993).

However, as there are a myriad of bodily traits that "indicate" sex, Butler posits that it (sex) cannot be the same as the means by which it is indicated, leading her to conclude that these "bodily indicators are [therefore] the cultural means by which the sexed body is read" (Butler, 2004: 87). Given that they are at once bodily as well as signifiers, it follows that there is no easy way of knowing what is "materially" true as opposed to what is "culturally" true about a sexed body (Butler, 2004: 87), rendering the signs irreducibly cultural and material at one and the same time. However, as these political signifiers are not stable and indeed can be subverted as part of, say, male drag acts (Butler, 1990a), it follows that they can never fully establish the identity to which they refer (Butler, 1993). As such, there is always something that we cannot know about them, the very point articulated by Adorno in his theory of negative dialectics. It follows, therefore, that if sex was just masquerading as gender all along (Butler, 1990a), then gender is not a role that expresses or disguises an interior self (Butler, 1990b), but is instead "performative –

that is, constituting the identity it is purported to be" (Butler, 1990a: 25). It is therefore an act that one performs, an act that "has been going on before one arrived on the scene", and which has been rehearsed many times (Butler, 1990b: 277).

Although the concept of "performativity" (Butler, 1990a: 25) questions the notion of a subject who pre-exists the deed, Butler (1990a: 142) argues that there is no need for a "doer behind the deed" for the simple reason that the doer is constructed "in and through the deed". Despite being accused of "debunking" the concept of agency as mentioned earlier in the chapter (Benhabib, 1995: 21), Butler (1993: 15) counters that argument by positing that the "constitutive constraint" of performativity does not preclude the possibility of agency, but rather that it locates it as a "reiterative or rearticulatory practice".

It is in this way, she argues, that rigid gender roles are not just the result of social conditioning but the outcome of a more "subtle set of practices" (Eagan, 2006: 284) that subjects are required to enact if they are to avoid societal sanction. For instance, the performative utterance "It's a girl" initiates the process by which a certain "girling" is compelled (Butler, 1993: 232) so that to qualify and remain a girl, the subject is compelled to adhere to certain norms. This girl, therefore, has to cite the norm in order to first qualify and then remain a viable subject, with the result that femininity is not the outcome of choice but the forcible citation of a norm (Butler, 1993).

Acknowledging that certain formulations of the radical constructivist approach can prove frustrating in the sense that constructivists seem to deny the reality of bodies (Butler, 1993), Butler (1993: 8) accepts that not everything is discursively constructed - there is an "outside" but it is not an absolute one. The problem,

however, as she points out, is how to access material reality, given that by virtue of conceding some version of sex, we simultaneously contribute to the formation of the very phenomenon that was just conceded (Butler, 1993).

As part of her dialectical argument, she says that the subject can only be constructed "through acts of differentiation that distinguish [it] from its constitutive outside" (Butler, 1995: 46). As the constitutive outside is "that which can only be thought" (Butler, 1993: 8), it does appear that Butler is suggesting that we can only access material reality through discourse. At the same time, however, she makes clear that despite being "constituted by discourse", that does not automatically mean that subjects are also "determined" by it (Butler, 1990a: 143). This is because "materialization is never quite complete" (Butler, 1993: 2) in that bodies do not fully comply with the norms that compel their materialization. In other words, by drawing on non-identity thinking, Butler is able to demonstrate that gender is not a totalising ideology because otherwise how could it ever be identified, understood and analysed? In much the same way, she deconstructs the term "women", arguing that it can never fully describe what it is attempting to name, not least because of "the constitutive instability of the term" (Butler, 1993: 218).

Adorno also accepts (as does de Beauvoir) that discourse influences and shapes the materiality that it is supposed to mirror. Given that, for Adorno, thought can never completely capture its object, it follows that the object (in this case, the body) always exists outside, and independently of, thought's conception. Indeed, he writes that "the object always remains something other than the subject … Not even as an idea can we conceive a subject that is not an object; but we can conceive an object that is not a subject" (Adorno, 1973: 183). By emphasising the role of the object, Adorno is able to show that the relationship of subject and object is not just a

matter of the subject's choice. This, in turn, means that he can preserve the difference between subject and object by arguing that there is always an object behind thought. In other words, as the concept of gender can never be fully adequate to its "masculine subject" or "feminine object" (Cornell and Thurschwell, 1987: 159), then the truth of what we are as subjects can never be fully captured by gender categories (Leeb, 2008). To put it another way, the concepts of sex and gender can never equate to the object of the body. Although Butler does not explicitly use these terms to make her argument, her philosophical approach is, as shown in this section, broadly underpinned by non-identity thinking.

Adorno, feminism and identity politics

In the previous section I considered some of the similarities between the analyses of the sex/gender debate as articulated by Simone de Beauvoir and Judith Butler and Adorno's theory of negative dialectics. In particular I noted that Butler and Adorno agree firstly that both sex and gender are concepts; and secondly that because sex is a gendered category, the two concepts cannot be neatly separated into bodily signifiers on the one hand and cultural signifiers on the other. Crucially, they both argue that because identity is unstable, it cannot fully describe what it names. In addition, like Adorno and Butler, de Beauvoir emphasises the importance of the body which, as indicated above, is a sexed and socialised body, not just a biological one. In other words, it is a "situation" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 750) which, as de Beauvoir pointed out, has to be understood through the prism of the prevailing "ontological, economic, social and psychological contexts" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 48).

These contiguities between Adorno and certain, critical strands of feminism are not surprising, however, given that his main aim was to challenge the whole basis and remit of traditional philosophical discourse which, he argued, had failed to

change the world. Otherwise, "[p]hilosophy, which once seemed obsolete" would not live on (Adorno, 1973: 3). The only reason it does is "because the moment to realise it was missed" (Adorno, 1973: 3). In much the same way it can be said that critical feminist theory in the 1980s and 1990s demanded a re-think of the origins and limits of philosophy (not least because of its historical androcentrism), leading to a growing affinity with emancipatory thinkers like Adorno and Horkheimer (Benhabib, 1992; Cornell, 1995; Fraser, 1995).

That is not to say there is a consensus within these strands of feminist theory about what theoretical stance they should take on the politics of identity, but there is sympathy within the critical feminist school of thought for the emancipatory agenda of the Frankfurt School (Gannon and Davies, 2012). Not surprisingly, perhaps, critical strands of feminism have drawn much more on this philosophical approach than those of, say, poststructural strands (Gannon and Davies, 2012), as indicated earlier. Equally, however, as I have already mentioned, not all critical theorists are unsympathetic to all poststructural ideas although it is fair to say that two of the most prominent historically – Benhabib (1992, 1995) and Fraser (1995) - are particularly critical of the notion that there is no such thing as an autonomous female subject capable of self-reflection and agency.

Critical theory has, conversely, been found wanting with regard to its failure to explicitly engage with feminism (Fraser, 1985; Hartmann and Markusen, 1980; Mills, 1987); in particular, the Marxist assumption that women, as passive beneficiaries of the liberation of men, will somehow be freed when men become emancipated (O'Brien, 1979). Although some feminists, such as Mills (1987), accept that the theorists of the Frankfurt School acknowledged men's domination of women, she has criticised them for doing so through a male lens. For instance, in the mythic tale

of Homer's Odyssey in the *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, Horkheimer and Adorno claim to consider the repression of instincts and the ways in which reason becomes an instrument of self-preservation, a trade mark of enlightenment thinking (Yun Lee, 2005). Mills (1987), however, says they virtually ignore the impact of repression on the female psyche in that they tell the story primarily in terms of male recognition and identity, ignoring female desire except in so far as it relates to promiscuous heterosexual desire with the result that the text lacks positive images of women. For instance, Odysseus, the prototypical bourgeois male subject, is only able to resist the lure of the Sirens by being bound to the mast of his ship thereby preserving himself through the "cunning of reason" (Yun Lee, 2005: 29) but at the cost of restraining his own instinctual desires. Although Horkheimer and Adorno interpret the song of the Sirens as the call of sexuality, Mills (1987) argues that it represents instead the call of nature, the male perception of woman as the all-powerful mother figure. The desire by Odysseus to yield to the Sirens therefore reflects the male desire to give up responsibility for the self, a desire that, dialectically, means death to the male ego (Mills, 1987). Conversely, as it can be assumed that the Sirens self-destruct once defeated, Mills (1987) argues that their self-destruction represents the sacrifice of the mother to the development of the male ego.

Hewitt (2006), however, argues that Horkheimer and Adorno adopted two dialectical strategies within *Dialectic of Enlightenment* for dealing with women's subordination. The first was to forcibly include them by acknowledging their self-alienation in the patriarchal world in the "complementary forms" of prostitute and wife (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2002: 57); the second was to include them by virtue of their exclusion from an analysis of a male discourse of power (Hewitt, 2006). As such, their critique of the alienation of Odysseus from nature and his body and the

objectification of women's body as an instrument of sexual pleasure can contribute to the feminist debate about sexual objectification (Kellner, 1989). Hewitt (2006) therefore takes the view that what is sometimes interpreted as a nostalgia for patriarchy in the book is actually a nostalgia for a system of domination in which injustice can be experienced as pain. A good example of this is the description they include in the book of women being hung because they were unfaithful, not as a way of punishing them for transgressing patriarchal boundaries of female sexuality, but rather as an acknowledgement to the memory of suffering (Heberle, 1996).

Whatever one's interpretation of these critiques, they provide at the very minimum an indication of Adorno's concern with women's subordination and his efforts to incorporate that concern within his philosophical interests, stemming from his 1937 letter to Erich Fromm at the Institute of Social Research (Duford, 2017; Ziege, 2003). Although the Institute (where the Frankfurt School was originally located) did not follow through on Adorno's proposal to research the "feminine character" (Ziege, 2003: unnumbered), it certainly seems to have been an early attempt by Adorno to develop a radical gender perspective on capitalism, allowing feminists to highlight the "critical and emancipatory moments" of his writings (Duford, 2017: 790). Adorno carried on this critique in *Minima Moralia* where he included a number of aphorisms which have been described as "proto-feminist" (MacCannell, 1999: 143). These start with "Where the stork brings babies from" (Adorno, 2005: 87) which addresses the question of sex and gender, albeit by drawing on different metaphors which articulate the body's presence through its absence (Yun Lee, 2006).

Far from essentialising women in these writings, Adorno sets out his thoughts on the "distortion" of the "feminine character" (Adorno, 2005: 95), sexuality and

marriage while astutely observing that individuals are not formed in "abstraction" but rather are forced to become subjects as "the result of a social division of the social process" (Adorno, 2005: 153). In this way, Duford (2017: 793) argues that, by depicting the "social construction of sex and gender binaries" as the "wrong life" in *Minima Moralia*, Adorno endorses the idea that there is no more need for the "substructure or mechanism" (Ziege, 2003: last page) of biological sex than there is for gender, a point confirmed by both Butler and de Beauvoir. Indeed, it begs the question as to whether feminists should stop using the terms altogether and instead refer to culturally and socially inscribed bodies, or the "sexed body" (Butler, 2004: 87). This approach would, at a minimum, accommodate the possibility of unstable designations, thereby encouraging the opening-up of terms rather than their reduction to the kinds of restrictive categories that are generally found within corporate diversity discourse, as discussed in Chapters Five and Six.

Acknowledging that women have a different experience to men within bourgeois society, Adorno is also careful not to specify a particular definition of femininity that would fall into the trap of identity thinking (Yun Lee, 2006), unlike Nietzsche whom Adorno accuses of falling for "the fraud of saying 'the feminine' when talking of women" (Adorno, 2005: 96). In other words, Adorno is making clear that the concept of femininity is neither innate nor natural (Yun Lee, 2006), in much the same way as de Beauvoir when she referred to the "eternal feminine" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 12). Whilst he accepts that woman represents the "alien" (or the "other") (Adorno, 1973: 191) to a narcissistic male ego, Adorno does not mean a binary or polar opposite of the masculine, but rather one that disrupts the totalising concept of masculinity which asserts itself over bourgeois society (Yun Lee, 2006).

Again like de Beauvoir, he wants to disrupt the notion of woman as the "inessential" and man as the "essential" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 6). As such, Adorno re-evaluates otherness as a form of negativity when he says that: "The feminine character is a negative imprint of domination" (Adorno, 2005: 95) or as de Beauvoir put it: "He is the Subject; he is the Absolute. She is the Other" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 6). Because Adorno wants the object to be prioritised, he is effectively arguing that rather than the object being the "Other" or the inessential it needs to become what is "other than" subjectivistic thought. This approach also allows him to reinforce his view, in terms that foreshadow Butler, that performed aspects of gender are no more than a reflection of the effects of patriarchal domination (Duford, 2017).

However, as Duford (2017) points out, there is nothing natural about a domination that is constructed by male violence. Adorno, she says, is uncompromising in his condemnation of the conditions of patriarchy in which women have to undergo love as "objects of violence" (Adorno, 2005: 90), not least because those conditions of patriarchy force women to be, through male violence, what men want them to be: "a she-man" (Adorno, 2005: 96). Indeed, Adorno comes close at this point to articulating the description made famous by de Beauvoir of woman as the subordinate or "second sex", the "Other" to the universality of man (Yun Lee, 2006: 129). Instead of someone who hurts when she bleeds, woman has to present herself as a "flower" for her husband to pick, because it is assumed that is what he wants her to be. Adorno, on the other hand, is clear that the woman who "feels herself a wound when she bleeds knows more about herself than the one who imagines herself a flower because that suits her husband" (Adorno, 2005: 95). This insight suggests that he both knows and does not know what a woman is (Duford,

2017), an approach that directly aligns with his theory of non-identity thinking as well as the feminist writings of both de Beauvoir and Butler.

Adorno, history and non-identity thinking

As explained earlier in the chapter, non-identity thinking "seeks to say what something is" (Adorno, 1973: 149), allowing the dissonance between the concept and the object to emerge, thereby revealing the shortfall in conceptual thought. It follows that if non-identity thinking allows for the possibility that the term "woman" means something other than we declare her to be, then it offers a way of developing a negative dialectical understanding of what it means to be a woman (Howie, 2006). For instance, de Beauvoir's (2011: 750) concept of the body not as a thing but as a "situation" or Butler's (1990a: 25) reframing of sex/gender as "performative" are, I would suggest, both examples of non-identity thinking.

Although de Beauvoir argues that the body of woman is one of the essential elements in her situation in the world, she also makes clear that it is not enough to define her as woman (de Beauvoir, 2011). That does not mean that the term "woman" ought not to be used, as Butler (1995: 50) explains, but rather that it "designates an undesignatable field of differences, one that cannot be totalized or summarized by a descriptive identity category". That being so, "the very term becomes a site of permanent openness and resignifiability" (Butler, 1995: 50). In other words, by acknowledging that we cannot know everything about a category simply by describing it, we can allow for the possibility that it means more than we first realised.

One way of attempting to explore the question of what it means to be a woman might be to undertake a genealogical analysis of the interests driving classification (Butler, 1990a; Fraser, 1995; Nicholson, 1994). Although Adorno did

not use the term genealogy to describe his approach to history, Allen (2017) argues

that the outlines of a genealogical approach can, in fact, be found in his work,

through his view of history as a story of both progress and regress. Of particular

value is Adorno's concept of discontinuous history which represents "life perennially

disrupted" (Adorno, 2006a: 91), whereby he challenges the assumption that one

particular idea runs through history as a whole. History is not a process of ceaseless

innovation but rather one that is "thoroughly discontinuous" (Adorno, 2006b: 266).

Once we are aware of this discontinuity, we inevitably become more doubtful about

the possibility of understanding history "as the unified unfolding of the idea" (Adorno,

2006a: 91). As such, "the consciousness of discontinuity is simply that of the

prevailing non-identity" (Adorno, 2006a: 92). For instance, in order to provide

insights into historical processes and human behaviour in the *Dialectic of

Enlightenment*, Adorno and Horkheimer are said to have adopted a genealogical

approach explaining connections between events and their preconditions as a

continuous process of formation and transformation (Bauer, 1999).

Adorno's concept of a dialectical philosophy of history which challenges

grand narratives but from within an emancipatory framework, might also help to

resolve the disagreement between feminist poststructuralists who are sceptical of

grand narratives and universalising causes (Baxter, 2003); and critical theorists who

are equally sceptical of the value of killing off "grand narratives" (Benhabib, 1995:

22) resulting in the death of emancipatory history. Adorno does this by emphasising

the need to keep two concepts in mind simultaneously – discontinuity and universal

history. This non-identical view of history then allows us to remember "what gives

history its unity … as well as what doesn't" (Adorno, 2006a: 92). By not losing sight

of his observation that history is "highly continuous *in* discontinuity" (Adorno, 2006a:

92, italics in original) we are less likely to forget that the task is not only to construct but also to deny universal history.

This dialectical approach is similar to Butler's (1990a: 5) concept of a "feminist genealogy of the category of women", in which she argues that gender identity could be "reconceived as a personal/cultural history of received meanings" (Butler, 1990a: 138), allowing earlier forms of a practice to be endlessly re-interpreted by later forms in an indefinite process of evolution (Stone, 2004b). By recognising and accepting the overlapping and "unpredictable assemblage of positions" (Butler, 1990a: 14) among women that are uncovered by this genealogical process, Butler (1990a) argues that it becomes possible to build a coalitional politics that allows for multiple interpretations of what it means to be a woman. By understanding gender as a concept that offers a way of situating oneself within cultural norms (Butler, 1987b), it becomes possible for women to be seen as not just passive beings moulded by exterior cultural forces, but also as beings who actively take on a gender by appropriating and adapting meanings with reference to the different contexts in which they find themselves (Stone, 2004a). This approach therefore allows not just for different meanings of femininity but also for constant changes in the interpretation of those meanings (Stone, 2004a).

As these women are engaged in reworking the same set(s) of pre-existing meanings, they are linked by their overlapping interpretations of femininity (Stone, 2004a). Given that there is continuity as well as discontinuity within these interpretations, Stone (2004) concludes that a genealogical approach can accommodate both continuities and discontinuities within the history of femininity (Stone, 2004a). When applying non-identity thinking to the concept of "woman", we can therefore say that the prevailing non-identity is the constant shifting in the

meanings of gender and femininity, thus linking women over time in a series of gradually diminishing connections with women of previous generations that is both continuous and discontinuous (Stone, 2004a). This concept also highlights the historical nature of the essentialist categories and associations underpinning gendered occupational segmentation enabling feminists to trace a link between women showing the different ways in which they have been discriminated against, across time and across cultures. Drawing on this concept, non-identity thinking can also offer a way of understanding the contradictory nature of women's dissonant experiences, which are evidence of the contradiction between their own lived complexities and the roles they are expected to occupy in a patriarchal, capitalist and corporate society (Howie, 2006).

Adorno, feminism and freedom

Eagan (2006) suggests that this disjuncture between an ideal subject and the real conditions that the subject faces can be illustrated using Adorno's concept of freedom. In particular, his dialectic of freedom and unfreedom, which offers a way to consider how the oppressed (such as women), can attain a critical perspective from which to redefine and question their suffering as "objects of violence" (Adorno, 2005: 90). According to Adorno, suffering is a type of unfreedom, but one which reveals itself to us when we experience it. When we do, it shakes us out of our acceptance of the status quo so that what we experience saves us from the totalising power of ideology (Eagan, 2006). By describing freedom as a counter image to the suffering brought on by social coercion (Adorno, 1973), Cook (2008) suggests that Adorno wants us to think of emancipatory movements that will give rise to the idea of a condition in which oppression will end because freedom arises in the form of resistance (Adorno, 1973). Negative dialectics therefore points to unfulfilled

potentialities for emancipation by uncovering values which are immanent to its object but negated by the actuality of that object (Held, 1980). As such, Adorno wants to bring about a "better state …. In which people could be different without fear" (Adorno, 2005: 103).

However, Adorno also warns that idealism comes to terms with suffering very quickly with the result that it is "sold back" (Eagan, 2006: 283) to us as inevitable and beyond our control. Hence Adorno's concern with the implications for women of being admitted into the "masculine" liberal competitive economy, leading him to (rather presciently) predict that it would be used to argue that the "question of the condition of women" is no longer "acute" (Adorno, 2005: 92). This act of admitting women into "every conceivable supervised activity" (Adorno, 2005: 92).from which they had previously been excluded is not therefore a step towards emancipation, according to Adorno, but a gesture that simply weakens the ability of women to recognise the true extent of their oppression. As a result, "[In] big business they remain what they were in the family, objects" (Adorno, 2005: 92). This sentiment was also echoed by Fraser when she identified a "dangerous liaison" between feminism and marketisation, urging feminists to break such an "unholy alliance" (Fraser, 2013: 2) by recognising that the capitalist system which, while promising liberation, "actually imposes a new mode of domination" (Fraser, 2013: 225). This new mode of domination not only presents women as independent agents who no longer face inequalities or power imbalances (Duffy et al., 2016), it also holds them responsible for their failure to be appointed to the boards of companies in greater numbers, a point to which I return in Chapter Six.

In other words, Adorno's argument is that women's so-called emancipation from past enslavement is effectively a sham in the sense that, whilst they were

previously faced with the prospect of marriage "which seemed to lead to freedom", they now have the prospect of a job in the "system of modern industry" (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2002: 84), closing off the avenue of love. Although Adorno does not have any specific answers to this conundrum he still looks towards the prospect of an emancipated society which would allow for the reconciliation of differences (Adorno, 2005). Liberation does not therefore consist of making woman equal to man (as that just leads to the dehumanisation of both under capitalism), nor in obliterating any differences that might exist between them (Yun Lee, 2006), but rather in a "reconcilement" that allows the "alien" to remain "distant and different" (Adorno, 1973: 191) whilst at the same time eradicating the hierarchical (Yun Lee, 2006). Sadly, however, it seems that, for the time being at least, this ambition is doomed to remain a utopian promise in a reified society that continually resists its moment of non-identity.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I outlined Adorno's critique of identity thinking whereby he highlights the ways in which the object is confused with the concept in subjectivistic thought. Not only does conceptual thought underestimate the complexity of objects, however, he argues that it also assumes that it is possible to know everything about an object once all possible classifications of it have been made. As woman is associated with nature, while men are associated with culture, I highlighted the ways in which the body of woman, as an object, has become equated with her sexed and gendered characteristics such that she is reduced to a biological, as opposed to a cultural, entity. That being so, Adorno's critique of identity thinking makes clear that, in order to tackle a phenomenon such as the under-representation of women on corporate boards, it is necessary to confront the essentialism which lies at its core

as well as the organisational practices that underpin it, as I go on to explain in Chapter Five.

It is of particular concern therefore that this type of thinking has been embedded within the instrumental logic of the business case for diversity which, by viewing women solely in terms of the potential value that they might bring to the organisation through their essential characteristics, has shifted the equalities discourse from one of social justice to a rationality dominated by the marketplace. It simultaneously emphasises the importance of the unique individual who is responsible for their own transformation, as discussed further in Chapter Five. As a result we have now reached the point whereby "no theory today escapes the marketplace" (Adorno, 1973: 4). That is not to say that critical diversity scholars have not written at length about the mechanistic thinking that underpins the business case, but rather that Adorno's philosophy can add to that debate by bringing a new perspective which analyses it through the lens of exchange value, thereby emphasising the extent to which the diversity "transaction" always benefits the stronger party, whatever organisations state to the contrary.

Even more helpful, I would suggest, is Adorno's exposition of the dialectic of nature and history in which he highlights the complex ways in which the social has become conflated with the natural to the extent that they are now indivisible. For instance, in Chapter Five I discuss the ways in which organisations argue as part of the business case that women qua women have certain characteristics that can be harnessed to improve corporate profitability. Apart from being essentialist and therefore a classic case of identity thinking, Adorno argues that nature does not simply consist of the natural but is also interwoven with the historical. In order to expose the historical dimension in something that seems natural, he draws on the

concept of "second nature", thereby allowing him to reveal the ways in which historical and social constructs are intertwined so as to appear natural. By applying this dialectical understanding of history and nature to the dimensions of sex and gender, it becomes possible to identify and analyse the ways in which these concepts have come to be viewed as governed by natural, rather than social, laws. It also indicates that, in order to locate the "remainder" offered by non-identity thinking (Adorno, 1973: 5), it is necessary to analyse the relationship between the concepts of sex and gender and the object of the body rather than simply the concepts themselves.

Likewise, de Beauvoir's concept of "situation" allows feminists to situate the body both socially and historically, as does Butler's (2004: 87) formulation that there is no easy way of knowing what is "materially" true as opposed to what is "culturally" true about a sexed body. I am not therefore arguing that feminists "need" Adorno in order to arrive at these insights, but rather I am drawing attention to the similarities between many of these feminist thinkers and a philosopher who is not necessarily known for his feminist credentials but whose work, I suggest, offers a number of useful insights for feminism as indicated above and a different way in which to approach an analysis of the constructs of sex and gender. In particular, Adorno's emphasis on the priority of the object and his theory of non-identity thinking make a useful contribution to the debate by facilitating the understanding that the concepts of sex and gender can never be fully adequate to their "masculine subject" or "feminine object" (Cornell and Thurschwell, 1987: 159) emphasising the point that there must always be a "remainder" (Adorno, 1973: 5) which in turn fatally undermines the concept of essentialism.

This emphasis on the subject and its relationship with the object lies at the heart of Adorno's critique, as I have consistently made clear in this chapter. Given that my literature review was situated within feminist organisation studies scholarship with a particular focus on poststructuralism, I therefore included in this chapter a section which drew out the distinctiveness of Adorno's approach compared with that of the poststructuralists. This centred on the subject who, in poststructuralism, is determined by discourse compared to Adorno's subject who is situated as the agent of the object. In other words, the former views the subject as constituted and lacking agency, whereas Adorno wants the power of the subject to be limited rather than obliterated. Having said that, however, there are also many points of similarity between the two philosophical positions which I go on to consider in the next chapter.

Finally, I suggested that Adorno's dialectical philosophy of history reinforces the view of history as a story of both progress and regress (Allen, 2017). This notion is also encapsulated within a feminist concept of genealogy, whereby the interests driving the classification of women are constantly subject to revision. This facilitates an understanding of history as a process which allows for different meanings of femininity and constant changes in the interpretation of those meanings (Stone, 2004a). This process is what Adorno is referring to when he explains that the task of a dialectical philosophy of history is to keep the concepts of discontinuity and universal history in mind, with the result that history is not continuous or discontinuous. Instead it is continuous in its discontinuity (Adorno, 2006a).

It is this concept of genealogy as developed by the French philosopher, Michel Foucault, that I draw on in order to explain and evaluate the methodological approach I adopted in order to carry out a critical discourse analysis of the text and

images used on the website pages and annual reports of 30 FTSE 100 companies in relation to their diversity and inclusion discourse. My main aim in undertaking the analysis was to uncover "buried, subjugated knowledges" (Foucault, 1980: 83) in relation to the ways in which subjects are formed within organisations through this discourse and, likewise, how power relations operate to sustain the status quo. Although Foucault was not interested in a search for the beginning, he was, much like Adorno, interested in emancipating "historical knowledges" from the coercion of a "scientific discourse" (Foucault, 1980: 85) by highlighting changes over time in their meaning and purpose. However, that is not to say that Adorno and Foucault did not have their differences. As I pointed out earlier in this chapter, they differ in the ways in which they theorise the subject in that Foucault viewed it as constituted within discursive formations and therefore lacking in agency, whereas Adorno viewed it as the agent of the object, as opposed to its constituent (Adorno, 1998).

In the second part of the chapter, I outline and explain my textual research methods which, as mentioned earlier, involved carrying out an online critical discourse analysis of the text and images of the annual reports as well as the equality and diversity pages of the top 15 and bottom 15 companies as listed in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report. In addition, I drew from a number of government reports as well as newspaper articles from a range of UK sources which emerged following a Google search of the 30 companies in my sample based on their relevance to the research questions.

Chapter Four

Researching corporate diversity discourse critically

Introduction

Chapter Three explored aspects of Adorno's critical theory and considered some of the ways in which it complemented feminist literature in relation to the concepts of sex and gender, with a particular emphasis on the work of Simone de Beauvoir and Judith Butler. I also set out how some aspects of this literature can be distinguished from feminist poststructuralism, thereby allowing me to start articulating Adorno's distinctive, theoretical contribution, a process which I continue in Chapter Six and the Conclusion. In particular, the chapter focused on his critique of identity thinking which highlights the tendency of humans to think in categorical, essentialist terms. This includes the tendency to divide the world into the binary categories of man and woman, male and female and the essentialist stereotypes that are attributed to these binaries within organisational diversity discourse.

The chapter also focused on the significance of Adorno's inquiry into natural history whereby he explained changes in meaning of phenomena through the interweaving of the historical and the natural. By applying this dialectical understanding of history and nature to the concepts of sex and gender, I suggested that it facilitated an understanding of how they have come to be viewed as governed by natural, rather than social, laws. By focusing on the ways in which women are identified with nature, the chapter also pointed out that the object of woman has become equated with the concept of her sexed and gendered characteristics. In this way, certain of women's so-called essential qualities (that they are kind, caring etc) have become accepted as being natural, essential or biological as opposed to

social. By failing to question the belief that the social is natural, I suggest in Chapter Five that organisations have ended up perpetuating, rather than resolving, the problem of occupational segmentation.

This tendency to equate the concepts of sex and gender with the object of woman's body lies at the heart of identity thinking and underpins the central premise of this thesis. That is, that gendered occupational segmentation stems from essentialist, identity thinking which assumes that conceptual consciousness should take priority over things or objects. This way of viewing the world stands in stark contrast to Adorno's argument that an object is always "something other" than the concept (Adorno, 1973: 183). By focusing on the relationship between the subject and the object, Adorno's theory of non-identity thinking offers an alternative way to consider essentialism and binary thinking. In particular, it allows us to see that the object of the body amounts to more than the concepts of sex and gender. Or to put it another way, that the bodies of women add up to more than their sexed and gendered characteristics.

Finally, I suggested that in order to talk about women as a distinct, oppressed, social group, anti-essentialist feminists might find parallels between Adorno's dialectical philosophy of history and a feminist genealogy, given that both aim to facilitate an understanding of history as a process which allows for different meanings of femininity and constant changes in the interpretation of those meanings, whilst ensuring that women can still be identified as women (Stone, 2004a). The concept of genealogy was subsequently developed by the French philosopher Michel Foucault as a way of critically problematizing the present (Allen, 2017) and which I explore in more detail in this chapter with a particular emphasis

on his understanding of the role of knowledge/power in the production of subjectivity.

Firstly, however, I focus on the aspects of Foucauldian discourse analysis that I drew on to analyse my empirical data gathered from the websites and annual reports of 30 FTSE 100 companies, the results of which are set out in the next chapter. This approach complements my critical perspective in that Foucault's main focus is a critical analysis of the interplay between power and knowledge, a central concept within critical discourse analysis (CDA). In particular he is interested in the functions and effects of social processes and actions that govern our behaviours (Fairclough, 2005; Wodak and Meyer, 2009). Indeed Foucault is considered by Wodak and Meyer (2009: 10) to be one of the "theoretical grandfathers" of CDA. As a methodology, Foucauldian CDA is consistent with my theoretical approach in that its origins can be traced to the influence of the Frankfurt School of critical theory (Wodak and Meyer, 2009). It therefore has many similarities with it, although as explained in the next section, it also has some important differences. As Adorno's critique of identity thinking and theory of negative dialectics provides the central framework for my theoretical approach, I also explain in a later section how I drew on his method of immanent critique to further analyse the data in Chapter Six. In particular, I focus on the relationship that Adorno emphasises between the subject and the object and the remainder that is left over.

In the second part of this chapter, I explain the research methods that I utilised to gather the data. In all, I studied the website pages related to gender diversity and equal opportunities as well as the annual reports of 30 companies identified from the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report which was the most up to date when I carried out my documentary analysis. This is an annual report (the

most recent being 2019) produced by Cranfield University and sponsored by the

Government Equalities office that monitors the numbers of women directors

(executive and non-executive) on the boards of FTSE 100 and 250 companies. I

chose to study the top 15 and bottom 15 companies from the FTSE 100 list on the

basis that these would provide a good cross section in terms of comparing boards

with the most women directors as opposed to those with the fewest. Although the

2016 report ranked the companies from 1 to 100 in order of the number of women

on their boards, this information has not been available in the subsequent versions

and I have been unable to find out the reasons for this change in approach, although

the authors were asked in an email by a third party on my behalf. In addition, this

documentation was supplemented by government or government-sponsored reports

as well as a number of newspaper articles from a range of different UK journals

which I found following a Google search of the different companies.

Although the philosophies of Foucault and Adorno complement one another in

many ways (Cook, 2013; Kellner, 1989; Mascaretti, 2017), I start this chapter with a

brief consideration of where the two diverge - mainly in relation to the social

construction of the individual and their different underlying ontologies of subjectivity.

I then go on to show the many similarities between Foucault's and Adorno's thinking

- in particular their understanding of the connection between power and rationality

as well as their understanding of history (Allen, 2017; Cook, 2013; Cook, 2014).

Comparing and contrasting the shared insights of Foucault and Adorno

According to Powers (2007), CDA emerged from the traditions of critical

emancipatory social theory at the Institute of Social Research known as the

Frankfurt School, as indicated in Chapter Three. Set up in the early 1920s, this was

(at least initially) home to thinkers such as Adorno and his close colleague,

Horkheimer, who worked within a Marxist or neo-Marxist tradition, and who believed that their task was to be critical of the world in general and capitalism in particular (Breeze, 2011). For instance, in his famous essay, *Traditional and Critical Theory*, Horkheimer criticised traditional theory for supporting the status quo by assuming that there were objective facts. Instead he argued that "[t]he future of humanity depends on the existence today of the critical attitude" (Horkheimer, 2002: 242). Although it is not always clear what is meant by the term "critical", it seems that members of the Frankfurt School were referring to the need to evaluate society from a political, emancipatory standpoint (Breeze, 2011), which is also the sense in which I am drawing on it. Although Foucault admitted in an interview in 1978 that had he "read these works" he "would have avoided some mistakes" (Foucault, 2000: 274), he is nevertheless credited with extending the critique of empirical analytic science to the human sciences developed by Adorno, among others (Kellner, 1989; Powers, 2007).

Although there are many similarities between the two theorists, it is important to first acknowledge some of the differences between them, particularly in relation to the concept of power and subjectification. As explained in Chapter Three, Adorno was highly critical of the subject, particularly with regard to its role in identity thinking. However, as an object can only be known "as it entwines with subjectivity" (Adorno, 1973: 186), he does not want the subject to be abolished. He therefore retains the subject but in a form which condemns it to an inevitable process of reification (Dews, 1989). Foucault, on the other hand, theorises the subject as though entirely constructed through social practices (Dews, 1989). For Adorno, the answer to the question of "who we are" lay in the "subjectifying" effects of exchange relations in capitalist society (Cook, 2014: 331; Cook, 2015). Foucault did not

identify the economy as the primary source of subjectification but rather pointed to power relations within institutions and the modern state, emphasising the normalising forces of disciplinary power on individuals (Cook, 2014; Cook, 2015). He did not therefore view power as hierarchical, but rather saw it as proceeding in every direction at once, rendering individuals as "the vehicles of power" (Foucault, 1980: 98) rather than its victims. He also accepted, however, that power relations were productive in that they were thoroughly embedded within economic conditions and the struggle between the classes (Cook, 2013; Cook, 2015). Indeed, Foucault (2000: 284) insisted that he never tried to claim that power could "explain everything". Far from trying to replace an economic argument with one about power, then, his intention was to systematise the different analyses he had made of power, but "without removing their empirical dimension" (Foucault, 2000: 284). So whilst it is hard to deny that Adorno emphasises the predominance of exchange relations and Foucault focuses on power relations, their theories are far from incompatible in that both acknowledge the critical importance of the economy in the process of subjectification (Cook, 2014).

Indeed, a number of authors have argued that there are as many complementarities between Adorno and Foucault as there are differences, particularly the way in which they perceive the connection between power and rationality (Allen, 2017; Cook, 2013; McCarthy, 1990). Both also emphasise the homogenising tendencies within society and the impact they have on the capacity for independent thought. But not only do they want individuals to resist those tendencies, they also want to promote what Adorno called non-identity thinking in order to foster a greater capacity for independent action and thought (Cook, 2013).

Foucault, like Adorno, was also highly sceptical of a dominant subject and the concept of a continuous history, arguing that: "continuous history is the indispensable correlative of the founding function of the subject" (Foucault, 1972: 12). Instead, as Allen (2017) points out, he viewed history as a story of both progress and regress, acknowledging that it was anything but neat and tidy (Poster, 1982). Rather than trying to totalise his position, therefore, Foucault allowed for gaps and missing connections in much the same way that Adorno emphasised the concept of the "remainder" (Adorno, 1973: 5) and the non-identical. The method they use to justify this approach to history, according to Allen, can be understood as a kind of problematizing genealogy, even if Adorno himself didn't use this term (Allen, 2017). As such, their ontologies of the present target a "reality" that is simultaneously material and historical. Although matter can never be disentangled completely from its historical representations, neither Adorno nor Foucault believe that something can come from nothing (Cook, 2013).

As this brief overview shows, there are significant and important similarities between the work of these two theorists. That being so, I have drawn mainly on Foucault's understanding of discourse (explained in more detail in the next section) as the basis of my methodology in order to identify and analyse the different discourses that I found within my empirical data in Chapter Five. However, given that my theoretical framework is centred on Adorno's critique of identity thinking, I have also operationalised the concepts discussed in Chapter Three to analyse the data that I gathered. I explain how I do this in more detail when I come to explain the stages of data analysis later in this chapter. Suffice to say for now that it follows the approach adopted by Berglund et al (2018) who carried out a Foucauldian discourse

analysis based on political theorist Nancy Fraser's analytical concepts of recognition, redistribution and displacement as tools for their empirical inquiry. However, as Adorno generally resisted "methodological exactness" (Benzer, 2011: 73), it is also important to explain how aspects of his critique can be operationalised in terms of methodology alongside Foucault's discursive approach, which I do later in the chapter when I come to provide a brief overview of immanent critique.

Foucault, critical methodology and discourse

There are a number of versions of discourse analysis but, as already mentioned, I draw on Foucault's critical approach which aims to reveal the representational properties of discourse as a vehicle for the exercise of power (Foucault, 1980). Indeed it is this emphasis on power and the effects it has on systems of knowledge and belief which helps define his connection to critical methodologies (Fairclough, 1992; Morrow and Brown, 1994). Although Foucault (1972: 80) admits that the term has a "rather fluctuating meaning", I was drawn to his description of discourses as "practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak" (Foucault, 1972: 49) because it highlights the mutually reinforcing nature of the relationship between the concept of discourse and the practices that constitute it.

Discourse is not, therefore, just about practices but rather the meaning that those practices embody and the power that they produce in the sense of what can be said and who has the power to say it. At the same time that discourse constitutes practices, however, it also conceals how they came about (Foucault, 1972). Foucauldian discourse is therefore, as Fairclough (1992) explains, not just a piece of text to be deciphered, but a political practice to be drawn on in order to understand how knowledge is formed and social processes created. In particular, it can be used

to identify and analyse the ways in which dominant ideologies appear to be neutral whilst actually supporting the status quo (Wodak and Meyer, 2009).

As such, discourses for Foucault do much more than just describe the world through the use of language; they actually constitute it by virtue of bringing things (objects) into being and by defining what is normal and acceptable (Hardy and Thomas, 2015) Discourses are therefore not just a "mere intersection of things and words" (Foucault, 1972: 48), but rather they constitute a group of rules which involve the "ordering of objects" (Foucault, 1972: 49). Foucault is not, however, interested in just one practice but rather a "regime of practices" where "what is said and what is done, rules imposed and reasons given, the planned and the taken for granted meet and interconnect" (Foucault, 1991b: 75). By viewing discourse as constitutive of practices as well as processes and events (Fairclough, 2010), it becomes possible to see how the world is arranged in specific ways which, in turn, informs social practice (Dye and Golnaraghi, 2015). Likewise it becomes possible to see how discourse arranges the world in terms of the assumptions that are taken for granted and those which are not, an insight that has particular relevance for corporate diversity discourse in the sense of helping to account for its underpinning essentialist assumptions.

Discursive practices, knowledge and power

Within discourse, then, a practice is formed according to clearly definable rules, making it available to historical analysis; and it is this history of "things said" (Foucault, 1991a: 63), this history of "discursive practices" (Foucault, 1991a: 64) in which Foucault is interested. Using what is said as his starting point, he focuses on the mechanisms through which these "things said" (Foucault, 1991a: 63) operate in order to install regimes of truth or knowledge (Bacchi and Bonham, 2014). This is a

particularly useful approach for my purposes in the sense that I analysed what companies said (or more precisely, wrote) on their websites and in their annual reports about diversity and inclusion by examining the text and images that they used to operationalise these discourses. Like Adorno, therefore, Foucault wants to reveal the ways in which these regimes of power mould and shape us, burying in the process the non-identity of people as well as society more generally (Cook, 2013). I have therefore focused on the "things said" by corporations in relation to diversity and inclusion in my data chapter in order to expose the gendered (and taken for granted) assumptions and contradictions that lie buried within corporate diversity discourse.

Intricately connected to the concept of discourse in Foucault's work is his view of power. This has been termed his most important notion because it forms the basis for the analysis of discourse (Powers, 2007). According to Foucault, the social body is permeated with "manifold relations of power" (Foucault, 1980: 93) which cannot be consolidated or implemented without the production and circulation of a dominant discourse. As there are no power relations that do not generate a field of knowledge, nor knowledge that does not constitute power relations (Foucault, 1995), knowledge and power (which come together within discourse) effectively form two sides of the same coin (Foucault, 1978). Power is not, therefore, something that people possess, but is an effect of discourse, thereby putting the focus on the relationship between power and discourse (Grant et al., 2009) as opposed to power itself.

This is a helpful concept for organisational theorists and indeed was usefully employed by Egan (2018) in his Foucauldian CDA of the online diversity statements of six Australian accounting firms in which he identified a tension between legislative

demands and the concerns of conservative clients. This tension led to limited, reserved LGBTI diversity statements with an emphasis on the responsibilities of employees, a repositioning which led to power remaining with management. Likewise, Zanoni and Janssens (2015) found in their discourse analysis of an international automobile company that diversity discourses exerted power by virtue of the ways in which they interlocked with occupations, highlighting the key relationship between categories of work and power relations, a point to which I return in the next two chapters.

Foucault's target of analysis, therefore, was not institutions, theories or even ideology but practices in order to understand the conditions that underpin them and make them acceptable at a given moment in time (Foucault, 1991b). For instance, he did not want to analyse imprisonment but rather the practice of imprisonment. As such he offered a way of linking the individual with a given practice in society. Following Foucault's lead, I therefore analysed in Chapter Five some of the everyday practices articulated by organisations that sustain online corporate diversity discourse. Although the most important aspect for Foucault was the analysis of micro-practices and the everyday activities of life (Powers, 2007), that is not to say that researchers should ignore the macro-level of analysis which situates power within the context of wider social relations (Allen, 1996; Fairclough, 1992; Fairclough and Wodak, 1997). Indeed, having examined the ways in which objects are formed and emerge in discourse, Foucault argues that we should then relate them to "the body of rules that … constitute the conditions of their historical appearance" (Foucault, 1972: 48), thereby linking his view of discursive power to Adorno's view of power as situated within the economic relations of capitalism. As such, I consider in Chapter Five the macro-discursive influences of postfeminism

and neo-liberalism as well as the impact of the shift from social justice which underpinned equal opportunities to the instrumental reason that lies at the heart of the business case for diversity.

In order to explain the ways in which historical concepts emerged and became transformed into discourse (Brooks, 1997; Saar, 2008), Foucault developed a number of methods, the two most significant being archaeology by which he meant the history of the rules that regulate particular discourses but which operate beneath the consciousness of the individual subject (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2000); and genealogy which referred to the attempt to emancipate the buried knowledge that lay within a formal, scientific discourse (Foucault, 1980). Although he regarded the two as complementary in the sense that they differed only in terms of emphasis (Foucault, 1980), genealogy has captured the attention of scholars more than archaeology mainly because of its scepticism about anything which is taken for granted or is assumed to be natural within contemporary society (Scheurich and McKenzie, 2005) and on which I focus in the next section. The epistemology driving genealogy is therefore an epistemology of critique as opposed to one of truth (Hook, 2005). As Foucault himself said: "This is because knowledge is not made for understanding; it is made for cutting" (Foucault, 1984: 88). Finally, it is important to clarify that I use the term "method" above with some hesitation as Foucault himself was reluctant to identify any specific method (Foucault, 1991b).

Genealogy, knowledge and the subject

Despite his use of the term genealogy, Foucault was not interested in the search for a "beginning" (Foucault, 1972: 131), but rather his aim was to "liberate a profusion of lost events" (Foucault, 1984: 81) encouraging us to think differently about how knowledge is produced and reified (Gannon and Davies, 2012).

Describing genealogy as an attempt to emancipate historical knowledge from the coercion of what he called "a theoretical, unitary, formal and scientific discourse" (Foucault, 1980: 85), his aim was to reveal "buried, subjugated knowledges" (Foucault, 1980: 83). In particular, Foucault was interested in understanding the historical processes of subject formation in terms of power (Saar, 2008). As such, Foucault's unitary discourse can be understood as the corollary of Adorno's identity thinking in the sense that he recognises the concept of a dominant discourse which subjugates people and blinds them from seeing the homogeneity imposed on them by reification, while his search for buried knowledges is an attempt to reveal the non-identical in discourse. Although it is not always clear what Foucault means by a "subject", it can be understood as a reference to an individual who is made "subject to" (Foucault, 1982: 781) someone else by a form of power that subjugates, thereby including the processes by which they are subjectified (Foucault, 1994).

This history of power and domination also plays a major role in the subjection of the body by which Foucault means domination by the power relations that subjugate individuals (Cook, 2013), a concept relied on in the next two chapters to explore whether women have been subjectified by corporate diversity discourse and if so, in what ways. Although the body has been written about in terms of its pathology, physiology and biology, among other things (King, 2016), Foucault points out that it is also "largely as a force of production" that the body is "invested with relations of power and domination" (Foucault, 1995: 26). Foucault's subject therefore constitutes itself in different forms through different practices at different times (Kelly, 2013). Indeed Foucault has said that the goal of his work was not to analyse power/knowledge but rather the ways in which human beings are made into subjects in our culture (Foucault, 1982). This happens, he argues, as a result of a

process whereby individuals internalise the "power of the norm" (Foucault, 1995: 184). As indicated above, he was therefore interested in "subjectification" which includes being made "subject to someone else" (Foucault, 1982: 781); or, as Adorno put it, the way in which people participate in their own domination by internalising instrumental reason (Kavanagh et al., 2005), without necessarily being aware of it.

For instance, Brewis (2019) drew on Foucauldian CDA to explore the practices used in diversity training to facilitate subject formation whereby the participants were "subject to" (Brewis, 2019: 97) the power and knowledge of the trainers in order to create an inclusive subject. Andersson and Hatakka (2017: 73) also used CDA to "unravel" the subject positions ascribed to women within organisational ICT policies in south and southeast Asia. This facilitated an analysis of language "beyond the sentence" (Andersson and Hatakka, 2017: 75) in order to identify three different subject positions – as victims, mothers, or an untapped working resource. By applying these CDA principles to my own data, I found that women were discursively constructed in three different ways - as different, as organisational outsiders and as deficient - as explained in more detail in Chapter Five.

This does not mean that subjects have no active role in their production. Indeed Foucault accepts that the process of internalisation does not always succeed (Cook, 2013), allowing for the possibility of resistance. Likewise, although Adorno's subject has a "compulsion to achieve identity" (Adorno, 1973: 157) in order to dominate the object and create a "self-identical subject" (Leeb, 2008: 357), he highlights the blind spot in this thinking by reminding us that there is always "a gap between words and the thing they conjure" (Adorno, 1973: 53), a point discussed in more detail in Chapters Five and Six. There is always, therefore, for both Adorno

and Foucault the possibility of critical agency, despite the internalisation of norms. As such a dialectical relationship always exists (at least potentially) between the ways in which discourse produces subjects but subjects (or some of them) also produce discourse to the extent that they resist, contradict or rewrite the discourse (Brewis, 2019). Indeed, it is because of resistance and pressure from the feminist movement over many decades that governments have introduced anti-discrimination legislation, compelling organisations to engage with a diversity agenda, however limited it might be in its effectiveness.

From Foucault's perspective, therefore, it is not only pertinent, but necessary, to ask how and under what conditions did this power/knowledge come to be exercised by certain groups of people and with what consequences in terms of the positioning of subjects (Alberts, 2013). It is these considerations, therefore, that led me to focus on the question of subject formation when analyzing my empirical data in relation to the practices through which subjects are produced (in other words, made subject to power) within organisational diversity discourse.

Critical discourse analysis, power and "reality"

It is clear from the above that the focus in CDA is not on the use of language per se but rather on the way it is operationalised in social and cultural processes and practices (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997). This approach stands in sharp contrast to other types of discourse analysis, in particular the discipline of critical linguistics which focuses much more on describing and analysing the patterns specific to language systems including grammar, semantics and vocabulary (Fairclough, 1992; Fairclough, 2010; Mautner, 2009; Wodak and Meyer, 2009) and how they can be used as ideological instruments (Machin and Mayr, 2012).

CDA, on the other hand, focuses on how meanings of language and discourse are affected by the relations that constitute social life, in particular the complex realities of power relations (Fairclough, 2010) by focusing beyond the "details of the text" (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2000: 1133) and generalizing to local contexts. As mentioned earlier, Horkheimer (2002: 199) in his famous essay compared the supposed formal logic and neutrality of the traditional theorist with the critical theorist who, he said, is primarily concerned with social justice and bringing about "reasonable conditions of life". Broadly put, the "critical" in critical discourse analysis relates to questions of how things are, why they are like that and, most importantly, why and how they should/could be different (Jancsary et al., 2016). It therefore makes no claims to be able to discover universal truths, but rather accepts that the process of analysis is always contingent on the standpoint of the researcher carrying it out (Graham, 2005), a point which is explained more fully towards the end of this chapter in terms of clarifying my own epistemological standpoint. As such, I do not claim that the methods used in my data analysis can lead to some objective conclusion (Bleijenbergh et al., 2018).

Analysing the production of texts from a Foucauldian perspective therefore involves far more than just a study of the language used in the text in that it includes questions about the role of power relations in the construction of our "realities" (Hardy and Thomas, 2015: 692). In this way, CDA aims to investigate how meaning is created in context (Bloor and Bloor, 2007) and how inequalities which come about through discourse help control the production, distribution and consumption of particular meanings in the form of text (Grant et al., 2009). Two of the main issues to consider, therefore, concern how this knowledge arises and the impact that it has on "constituting subjects" (Jäger and Maier, 2009: 34). In particular, the impact it has on

subjects who are defined or categorised as different and the implications of being categorised in that way.

As explained in Chapter Two, this concept of difference or the "Other" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 6) has also been a central focus of critical diversity studies (Ahmed, 2007; Christensen and Muhr, 2018; Holck et al., 2016; Ozbilgin and Tatli, 2011; Tatli, 2011), which considers in particular how Otherness, as a categorisation of difference, comes to be discursively constituted and sustained. For instance, the CDA focus adopted by Andersson and Hatakka (2017) facilitated the identification of three types of subject positions given to women within the ICT policies that they studied; while Elliott and Stead (2018) identified three dialectical sets of women's leadership representations in the media after the global financial crisis - as leaders and as feminine; as credible leaders and as lacking in credibility; as victims and as their own worst enemies.

CDA is also normative in that it addresses social wrongs and considers ways of righting them or at least mitigating them (Fairclough, 2010). It is not, therefore, neutral (Lazar, 2005) but is openly emancipatory, offering a particular way of representing certain aspects of the physical, social and psychological world (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997; Fairclough, 2010). As with critical theory, therefore, the aim of CDA is to develop a critique in order to change society (to paraphrase Marx) by challenging the status quo (Tenorio, 2011), not just to understand or explain it (Wodak and Meyer, 2016). In other words, the point of CDA is to identify the "manipulative nature" (Tenorio, 2011: 188) of discursive practices and how they change in meaning over time. In an organisational context, CDA can therefore be said to be concerned with the relationship between what is espoused and what is practised, a potential gap that I explore in the next two chapters.

Adorno and methodological concepts

Given the centrality of Adorno's philosophical theories to the thesis, it is necessary to operationalise certain aspects of his critique in addition to those of Foucault, as indicated earlier in the chapter. Having said that, it is important to make clear that although Adorno was interested in the study of texts in relation to mass culture, he preferred to undertake general critical commentaries of them, rather than systematic discursive analyses (O'Regan, 2006). The possible exception is his essay entitled "The Stars Down To Earth" in which he carried out a content analysis of an astrological column in the LA Times, (Adorno, 1994). In other words, Adorno resisted "methodological exactness" (Benzer, 2011: 73) on the basis that the tendency to explain reality through method was driven by a desire for identity. Specifically he worried that if methodology guided researchers to break down reality into a series of component elements, then it would lead them to think that they had succeeded in reducing reality to the sum total of those concepts through that methodology (O'Connor, 2013). I consider these potential pitfalls more fully later in the chapter when I acknowledge my own tendency to engage in binary thinking and the extent to which I have imposed my own standpoint on the data.

In relation to philosophical questions, on the other hand, Adorno took a much more systematic approach which he called immanent critique which aims to detect contradictions between the object's self-image and what the object appears to be in practice, thus allowing it to be problematised (O'Regan, 2006). In effect, to criticise immanently is to criticise an object "on its own terms" (Finlayson, 2014). It then becomes possible to assess or critique a society using the values that it would itself recognise as holding it together, thereby exposing the essentially irrational nature of society (O'Connor, 2013). The contradictions that emerge can then point to the need

for a non-contradictory reality in which certain ideals (such as happiness and freedom) might be realised without institutional structures (O'Connor, 2013). Adorno's approach to philosophical discourse does not, therefore, involve deductive logic, but rather it proceeds in a circular movement between universal concepts and particular facts (Nägele, 1982-1983; Zuidervaart, 1992). As such, immanent critique underpins Adorno's emphasis on the priority of the object in the sense that it challenges the subjective view that an object is nothing more than it appears to be. In Chapter Six, therefore, I operationalise Adorno's critique by mobilising the concepts discussed in Chapter Three, such as the tendency to classify and categorise (the essence of identity thinking) as a result of the priority of the subject, the dominance of exchange value and instrumental reason and the conflation of the concepts of sex and gender with the object of the body of woman. I also highlight the importance of the concept of the remainder (which emerges from the gap between the object and the concept) and the possibilities that it offers for progressing gender equality.

Feminism, gender and CDA

As CDA is openly committed to the achievement of a just social order, its analysis of discourse is particularly relevant for a feminist critique. Lazar (2007, 2018) argues that the important issue for feminists is to examine how gender ideology and gendered relations of power are produced, reproduced, negotiated and contested in representations of social practices. In particular, she argues that it should be aimed at deconstructing the hegemony of gender ideology which is often viewed as little more than common sense to the extent that it does not seem like domination at all (Lazar, 2007; Lazar, 2018). This internalisation of gendered norms is then acted out routinely in the texts and talk of everyday life, making it an

"invisible power" (Lazar, 2007: 148) in the sense that it is treated as legitimate and natural. By adopting a CDA framework, feminist researchers can explore how the dominant group not only determines these so-called common-sense meanings but also defines the purpose of the interaction and influences how it develops (Holmes, 2005). A good example of a CDA approach that uncovered three different subject positions constructed for women as "something different, something else" (Andersson and Hatakka, 2017: 77) from the main group (which was comprised of men) emerged from 11 organisational ICT policy documents adopted by government ministries in south and southeast Asia carried out by Andersson and Hatakka (2017), as mentioned earlier. Likewise, Elliott and Stead (2018) identified the ways in which women were framed within a media discourse promoting competing images of women in which they were evaluated simultaneously in terms of stereotypical feminine characteristics but against the default norm of male leadership. I also identified three subject positions from my own sample in the sense that women were framed as different, as organisational outsiders and as deficient.

However, because of the emphasis that Foucault places on individuals as "the vehicles of power" (Foucault, 1980: 98) rather than its victims, he has been criticised for ignoring this kind of invisible, gendered power. Indeed, although his theorising of sexuality as a discourse ostensibly embraces all human subjects, he has been accused of viewing it predominantly as a male attribute (King, 2004; Knights and Kerfoot, 2004). Equally, however, there are competing discourses within any field of knowledge and gender is no exception in the sense that not all women can be said to be victims of male oppression in the same way (Baxter, 2003). For instance, women board members are senior decision-makers who can exercise power over men as well as other women. Likewise, it is important to remember that gender

structures intersect with other relations of power based on race, class, sexual orientation and so on (Lazar, 2005). The question, then, is whether these competing, gendered discourses can be subsumed within Foucault's overall analysis of power. By relying on genealogy and its role in revealing "buried, subjugated knowledges" (Foucault, 1980: 83), including the "things said" (Foucault, 1991a: 63) - and written - by corporations in terms of diversity discourse, Foucault's argument tends to overlook the dominance of men in positions of organisational power from which women are routinely excluded. That does not, however, undermine his critical understanding of discourse and his analysis of power and subjectivity, nor its use as a basis for my methodology, as I now explain.

Documentary methodology

As I make clear in this chapter, I draw on CDA as a methodology to identify and analyse the "things said" (Foucault, 1991a: 63) as well as other practices through which power circulates and subjects are produced by the dominant discourses within organisational diversity discourse. Although there is no specific CDA-way of collecting data, Wodak and Meyer (2009) point out that many CDA approaches work with existing data. In other words, they work with data that was not specifically produced for the research project (Wodak and Meyer, 2009), but by organisations themselves, such as material that is publicly available on websites (Andersson and Hatakka, 2017; Heres and Benschop, 2010; Jonsen et al., 2019; Merilainen et al., 2009; Stockdale et al., 2018). For instance, Andersson and Hatakka (2017) critically analysed the ways in which women were constructed within ICT policies in south and southeast Asia that they found on government websites and through a Google search; while Stockdale (2018: 7) looked for different "signals" such as the business case or valuing diversity that appeared on the corporate

websites of FTSE 250 companies. Jonsen et al (2019) examined the diversity and inclusion statements they found on the websites of 75 major companies in five different countries; while others searched for textual and visual representations of equality and diversity in corporate responsibility reports and the recruitment sections of corporate websites that they studied (Heres and Benschop, 2010; Merilainen et al., 2009).

In terms of my research method (Bleijenbergh et al., 2018; Bowen, 2009; Bryman and Bell, 2015), I adopted a purely "gray, meticulous and patiently documentary" empirical research strategy (Foucault, 1984: 76) in that I carried out a CDA of the online annual reports and website diversity pages (found in different places on different websites, as explained later) of the top 15 and bottom 15 FTSE 100 companies, as listed in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report. I specifically drew on this report because it provided a ranking of all FTSE 100 companies in order of the number of women directors on their boards. I then selected a sample of 30 companies which enabled me to identify potential differences between the top 15 and bottom 15 in terms of the corporate discourses they employed. Other studies have analysed similar or smaller website samples, including Egan (2018) who studied the websites of six companies; Guerrier and Wilson (2011) who studied 28 websites; Heres and Benschop (2010) who studied ten companies and Merilainen et al (2009) who studied 20 companies. On that basis, I concluded that a sample of 30 companies gave me access to sufficient data allowing me to develop an empirically and theoretically grounded argument (Mason, 2018). In addition to this corporate discursive material, I drew on a range of government-sponsored publications as well as several published by the business community, along with a number of newspaper articles including the Guardian and

the Evening Standard. I found these articles after doing a Google search

(Andersson and Hatakka, 2017; Jonsen et al., 2019), the rationale for which is

explained in more detail in the section on additional secondary material.

This purely documentary approach had a number of advantages. For

instance, organisational documents (which can include codes of practice, annual

reports, mission statements, transcripts of speeches, press releases,

advertisements and other corporate publicity material) are freely available and easily

accessible online (Atkinson and Coffey, 2004), as are pages from company

websites. Although the addresses of website pages can change, they can be saved

using software such as NVivo or as a pdf document. Reports and policies, on the

other hand, tend to endure online, although they can obviously also be saved in

NVivo or in referencing programmes such as EndNote. In addition, documents are

"naturalistic" in the sense that they are not created for the purpose of the study and

are "unobtrusive" (Bleijenbergh and Fielden, 2015: 544) since they are not affected

by the process of studying them. Company documentation can also include "the

visual" which can cover not just the general image that is projected, but also

clothing, gestures and body language (Emmison, 2011: 236; Swan, 2010), as

explained in more detail in a later section. For instance, Elliott and Stead (2018)

adopted a multi-modal approach when analysing the gendering of women's

leadership role in the media following the global financial crisis.

Adopting a documentary approach with a focus on websites and annual

reports also meant that I could be confident of collecting data from every company

chosen from the Cranfield list, in contrast to relying, say, on a survey method, which

may result in a low response rate (Singh and Point, 2006). Finally, although there

are issues of credibility to bear in mind as the people who write publicity material, by

definition, want to project a particular point of view about the company (Bryman and Bell, 2015), this aim is precisely what makes documentary corporate material so suitable for CDA as it represents the discursive outcome of an internal process designed to generate a range of perspectives which are favourable to the corporation (Anaïs, 2013).

In terms of limitations that arise from adopting a documentary approach, researchers need to bear in mind that the documents have not been produced for research purposes and may not, therefore, provide what the researcher is looking for or they may not be in sufficient detail to answer the research question/s (Bowen, 2009). Sometimes it can be difficult to retrieve or locate the document or access may have been deliberately blocked. In addition, as mentioned above, it is necessary to remember that publicly available corporate documents have been produced to reflect corporate policies and procedures which may, depending on the research question, affect the credibility of the documentation.

Irrespective of the potential gap between words and the "thing they conjure" (Adorno, 1973: 53), however, it is always incumbent on researchers to ask a number of questions about texts, as already indicated. In my case this involved asking what was recorded on the websites and in the annual reports, what was omitted and what was taken for granted (Silverman, 2011), as discussed in the next two chapters. Given that I decided to focus on an analysis of the discourses in the documentation as opposed to carrying out interviews or ethnography, I accept that I cannot assess whether they were enacted, nor can I ascertain the actual impact on employees (Singh and Point, 2006). That said, however, as a reflexive researcher, I can comment on the impact that the discourses had on me as I read them and the understandings that I derived from them (Singh and Point, 2006). In addition, as

Mease and Collins (2018) point out, I was not able to identity whether and in what ways personnel such as diversity practitioners were able to be creative in terms of how the business case was deployed. Finally, though, I would just repeat that as my aim was to critically analyse the public face of corporate diversity discourse and not to assess how employees experience it, these potential drawbacks did not represent a specific concern for my thesis (Maier and Ravazzani, 2018). However, these questions about enactment and impact would certainly provide an interesting focus for further research.

Bearing these advantages and disadvantages in mind, I suggest there are five main reasons why adopting an approach based purely on documentary analysis provides an insightful way of exploring corporate diversity discourse. Firstly, it allows researchers to focus on the scripted text and formal image/s that companies have consciously decided to include in corporate documentation and on their websites. It seems fair to assume that this represents how companies want to be viewed by the outside world, given that corporate management has editorial control over the content of their annual reports and website pages (Cukier et al., 2017; White and Hanson, 2002), albeit constrained by legislative, social and market requirements, a point I consider in more detail in a later section.

Secondly, the fact that the authorship of websites and annual reports is anonymous may encourage companies to try to project the concept of an official or factual account (Atkinson and Coffey, 2004) that employees are then required to promote. Rather than providing an accurate representation of how they operate in practice, therefore, these artefacts can instead serve to reflect how companies want to be perceived, a tendency that is indicative of a performative reflexivity in which they act out the role of a benign and sympathetic employer, as explored in the next

two chapters. However, this performativity may simultaneously act as a technology of surveillance to which employees have to submit if they want to succeed (Foucault, 1995), thus making it difficult to resist. It is therefore important to dig under the surface of the "things said" (Foucault, 1991a: 63) or written by companies in order to reveal the historical and subjugated knowledges buried within them. Indeed, it was this approach that helped me to uncover some of the different ways in which women were positioned within corporate diversity discourse in my sample, as explained in the next chapter (Andersson and Hatakka, 2017). It also revealed the binary essentialist stereotypes on which so much of diversity discourse is based, which is also considered in more detail in the next two chapters.

Thirdly, annual reports reflect implicit social beliefs that companies have about themselves and their relationship with the surrounding world (Cukier et al., 2017; White and Hanson, 2002). In that sense, they do not just provide a record of compliance with legal requirements but also reflect their ethical and social stance on a range of issues and how it may or may not have changed over time. For example, Cukier (2017) found empirical evidence of a shift from ethics and compliance-based language to diversity management and the competitive advantage of diversity in the annual employment equity reports of the Canadian federal government over the period from 1988 to 2013. Far from acting as passive descriptors of an objective reality, therefore, corporate reports can play a significant part in forming a world-view that fashions women's place in society (Tinker and Neimark, 1987).

Fourthly, by adopting a solely documentary approach (as opposed to interviews and/or ethnography), I was able to compare what companies said in terms of their commitment to greater gender equality with what they have achieved in terms of the current representation of women in senior management and at board

level as cited in their annual reports. In other words, I was able to compare what they said based on the discourse contained on their own websites with what they had achieved in practice, based both on the information provided in their annual reports and in the Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report. Fifthly, a documentary approach allowed me to identify the many practices by which organisational discourse is produced and maintained (Omanović, 2011).

That is not to exclude or underestimate the validity of other methods. Indeed at one point I considered undertaking a series of interviews with senior corporate decision-makers but due to time and access constraints, I decided to adopt a purely documentary approach albeit with a view to potentially carrying out interviews in the future. In addition, by adopting this approach based on publicly available material, I knew in advance that I would be able to access all relevant material that had been posted online. Finally, I should add that, once I had reviewed a number of other document-based research studies (see Table One below) and analysed an initial sample of online corporate diversity material, I felt reassured that my documentary approach was sufficiently credible and rigorous.

Name of author/s	Methodology	Sources of analysis
Andersson and Hatakka, 2017	Foucauldian CDA	National ICT policies on government websites in south and southeast Asia
Cukier et al, 2017	Habermas discourse ethics and theory of communicative action	Newspaper articles and Canadian federal government annual reports
Elliott and Stead, 2018	Multi-modal discourse analysis	Text and images on business pages of three UK newspapers, 2009-2012
Egan, 2018	Foucauldian CDA	Websites of six large professional service firms in Australia

Heres and Benschop, 2010	Discourse analysis (social constructionist approach)	Diversity statements on websites of ten leading companies in the Netherlands
Jonsen et al, 2019	Content analysis	Five country comparison of diversity statements on websites of 75 major companies
Maier and Ravazzani, 2018	Multi-modal CDA	Text and videos on Google corporate website and official blog
Mease and Collins, 2018	Foucauldian CDA	Diversity statements on 94 corporate websites
Merilainen et al, 2009	Foucauldian CDA	Textual and visual analysis of diversity on websites of 20 largest Finnish companies
Singh and Point, 2006	CDA (social constructionist perspective)	Diversity statements on websites of 241 top European companies

Table One: Examples of studies showing methodology and sources of analysis

This table summarising the methodology of ten articles spanning a period of 13 years shows the range of discourse analyses drawn on by scholars. In particular, four drew explicitly on Foucauldian discourse analysis whilst two drew on a social constructionist approach. All, however, are linked by their adoption of a critical research approach based on documentary material.

Companies and search terms

In the next chapter I document the results of the CDA of the diversity material mobilised by the top 15 and bottom 15 companies (summarised in Tables Two and Three), as listed in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report. As explained, this was the most up to date list at the time I carried out my empirical research. It provided a list of all 100 companies, ranked from 1 to 100 in terms of the percentage and number of women on each company's board, along with the names of the

women and whether they were executive or non-executive directors (NEDs) and the names of the chairman (or very occasionally the chairwoman). In the subsequent reports, however, this ranking system was missing. Although the authors were asked by email why it had been omitted, no reply was forthcoming.

The top 15 companies in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report were:

Company	Product	Number of employees	Number of women employees	% (and number) of women directors
Diageo	Producer of beverage alcohol	32,000	Just under 11,000	45.5 (5 out of 11)
Next	Clothing retailer	50,000	34,000	44.4 (4 out of 9)
Kingfisher	Home improvement products retailer	74,000	Just under 30,000	44.4 (4 out of 9)
Unilever	Producer of food, home care, personal care and refreshment products	169,000	About 54,000	42.9 (6 out of 14)
Legal & General	Insurance and investment management group	8,000	4,000	40.0 (4 out of 10)
Whitbread	Hospitality company	50,000	About 29,000	40.0 (4 out of 10)
Old Mutual	Wealth manager	64,000	Just over 37,000	38.5 (5 out of 13)
Royal Mail	Letter and parcels delivery service	156,000	Just under 25,000	37.5 (3 out of 8)
3i Group	International investment manager	281	107	37.5 (3 out of 8)

Burberry	Luxury fashion house	11,000	Just under 7,400	36.4 (4 out of 11)
Marks & Spencer	Clothing and food retailer	83,000	Just under 60,000	36.4 (4 out of 11)
Intercontinental Hotels Group	Hotel operator	33,000	Just under 19,000	33.3 (3 out of 9)
Land Securities	Commercial property company	630	Just over 330	33.3 (3 out of 9)
Merlin Entertainments	Operates theme-parks and attractions	4,000	Just under 2,000	33.3 (3 out of 9)
Astrazeneca	Global pharmaceutical company	6,700 in UK	3,350 in UK	33.3 (4 out of 12)

Table Two: Top 15 FTSE 100 companies by number of female employees and directors

It is clear from the information available in the Cranfield report that, by 2016, these companies had all met the 25% target for gender representation recommended by the 2011 government-sponsored Davies report (Davies, 2011) as well as the target of 33% set by the subsequent report published in 2015 (Davies, 2015).

The bottom 15 companies in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report were as follows:

Company	Product	Number of employees	Number of women employees	% (and number) of women directors
Hammerson	British retail property developer	572	276	20.0 (2 out of 10)
Prudential	Financial services group	23,500	Just under 12,500	18.8 (3 out of 16)

Paddy Power Betfair	Sports betting and gaming operator	7,300	Just over 2,800	18.2 (2 out of 11)
Sky	Entertainment and communications business	30,000	10,000 approximately	18.2 (2 out of 11)
Inmarsat	Global satellite communications company	1,800	540	16.7 (2 out of 12)
Babcock International Group	Provider of engineering and technical services	35,000	Just under 6,700	16.7 (2 out of 12)
Centrica	Energy and services company	36,500	Just under 10,000	16.7 (2 out of 12)
Fresnillo	Gold and silver mining company	4,800	Just over 400	16.7 (2 out of 12)
Coca-Cola HBC AG	Bottler for the Coca-Cola company	31,000	Just over 7,100	15.4 (2 out of 13)
Glencore	Commodity producer and trader	155,000	26,350	12.5 (1 out of 8)
GKN	Design and manufacturing engineering business	50,000	Just under 10,000	11.1 (1 out of 9)
Worldpay Group	Multi-currency processor, card and mobile payments	5,000	2,000	11.1 (1 out of 9)
Mediclinic International	Private hospital group	30,000	23,400	9.1 (1 out of 11)
London Stock Exchange Group	Stock exchange and financial information company	3,600	1,200	9.1 (1 out of 11)
Antofagasta	Copper mining group	5,400	Just over 4,800	9.1 (1 out of 11)

Table Three: Bottom 15 FTSE 100 companies by number of female employees and directors

It is again clear from the Cranfield report that, by 2016, none of these companies had reached the 25% target set by Davies, let alone 33%. Indeed six of them only had one woman on their board at the time that the Cranfield research was carried out.

As others have pointed out (Rose, 2016), the value of discourse analysis depends not on the quantity of material used but on the quality of the analysis. In order to make the project manageable, I limited the source material to 30 companies (Anaïs, 2013). Although this was an artificial numerical limit, I consciously chose to research a cross section of the companies at the top of the list and compare them with the same number at the bottom of the list to explore whether the more "successful" companies (those with the most women directors on their boards) had adopted a different discourse or introduced different approaches to improve diversity in comparison with the least "successful" (those with the fewest women). As such, I chose to research the top 15 FTSE 100 companies on the Cranfield list along with the bottom 15.

I started each search on the company's website, using the following key words identified from the literature and other key studies: diversity/inclusion/diversity and inclusion; gender/gender pay gap/equal pay; equality; equal opportunities; merit; women (thereby also picking up references to men); women on boards. I then used the same search terms as part of a Google search, followed by a search of the company's most recent annual report again using the same terms (Andersson and Hatakka, 2017; Cukier et al., 2017). I then copied and pasted relevant phrases and paragraphs from the websites and annual reports into a word document for each

company. As explained below in more detail, I added two further search terms – transgender and non-binary – at a much later stage in the process.

Having completed these searches, I then wanted to start the process of establishing the dominant discourses. I identified some of them from their similarity to the search terms, while others were identified on the basis of the frequency with which they appeared during the actual searches (Andersson and Hatakka, 2017; Elliott and Stead, 2018; Jonsen et al., 2019; Merilainen et al., 2009). I started this process by carefully reading and re-reading through each summary document, as explained later in this chapter. However, as this was very time consuming, I created a composite document of all the summaries to do specific searches of words. I also exported the documents to NVivo creating nodes using the same search terms as I had used for the websites and webpages, thus ensuring that I picked up all relevant references to the key words on which my searches had been based (Singh and Point, 2006). NVivo was invaluable in this regard as it not only speeded the process up, but also simplified it by identifying key words in the transcripts.

As companies tend not to use terms such as essentialism or the business case for diversity, however, I was not able to use NVivo for these searches and therefore continued to analyse the texts by searching the composite document for certain words and phrases. To that end, I replaced the terms "essentialism" and the "business case" with references to phrases such as "female talent", "female skills" and "talented women"; as well as references to the business case using search terms such as "organisational performance", "business performance" "competitive advantage" and "long-term profitability". In relation to searching for practices and processes that companies have introduced to encourage greater gender equality, I searched for terms which I had found through repeat re-readings of my summary

documents, as explained later in this chapter. Finally, I carried out an analysis of the images of the people used by companies on their websites and annual reports (Andersson and Hatakka, 2017; Elliott and Stead, 2018; Singh and Point, 2006) as explained in more detail in a later section. Again, I did not use NVivo for these searches as I wanted to subjectively evaluate and analyse each image in terms of its representation of gender, as explained in Chapter Five.

Corporate diversity website pages

As already indicated, I carried out my searches on company websites as they are an indispensable medium for corporate communication, mainly as a way of presenting the organisation to external stakeholder groups such as customers, investors, the press and potential employees as well as existing employees (Pollach, 2010), effectively offering a "window" into the company (Gray, 2018: 582). According to a cross-cultural study of website readership by Pollach (2010), people visit the sites mainly to access recruitment and product information for work-related reasons. As Gray (2018) points out, however, websites are also increasingly being used as sources for carrying out research to find evidence of various business strategies as well as data sources for information about the company, such as its history, organisational structure, products and services and so forth.

By keying in the terms "company website" and "diversity" to the database Business Source Ultimate, I found a series of website studies covering different aspects of company diversity dating from 2019 back to 2006. These included a cross-cultural examination of the diversity statements on the websites of 75 major companies across five countries, concluding that the discourses of diversity (the most common being gender diversity) as well as that of inclusion were penetrating websites to such an extent that they could now be considered "mainstream" (Jonsen

et al., 2019: 3). Another, a documentary analysis of diversity in terms of nationality, age and gender on the board of directors for 30 companies listed on the stock exchange in Romania, found a lack of respect for the principle of diversity among the selected companies (Bîgioi and Bîgioi, 2017).

A third, by Heres and Benschop (2010), analysed statements on diversity, diversity management and equality on the websites of ten leading companies in the Netherlands, with the most common category being sex/gender. The authors found that although some aspects of diversity management had been imported into Europe from the States, these did not necessarily replace existing local discourses. The list also included a study by Singh and Point (2006) which considered how notions of gender and ethnicity were being integrated into diversity discourses presented on the websites of 241 top European companies, concluding that diversity statements sometimes reinforced existing business stereotypes of women and ethnic minorities and in a few discourses, created new ones. Interestingly, they also found that only a tiny minority of companies (6%) referred specifically to gender diversity as a source of competitive advantage and improved performance (Singh and Point, 2006), compared to over 60% in my sample carried out 10 years later. Similar to mission statements, online diversity statements are therefore being used increasingly to highlight employers' good corporate social citizenship and ethical management practices. They also contribute to the social construction of diversity by helping to shape how differences are to be considered, valued and managed in companies and the business world (Singh and Point, 2006).

As mentioned earlier, I found the statements in my sample in different places on different websites, ranging from corporate social responsibility (CSR) reports posted on the home page to diversity statements located deep within the websites.

For instance, Legal & General's CSR report (which includes a section on diversity and inclusion) was easily accessible on its corporate home page, while on the Diageo website the diversity page was located four layers down (Home/Sustainability & Responsibility/Building Thriving Communities/Our People/Diversity); and on the Unilever website it was situated three layers down (About Us/Who We Are/Diversity and Inclusion). It is hard to be definitive about who writes these statements as that very much depends on the diversity practice adopted by the individual company. For instance, the author could be a diversity manager or someone else within the diversity department, if there is one; alternatively responsibility could be devolved to a committee or individual managers (Kalev et al., 2006) or even an external organisation. In practice, however, website discourse is probably the result of a combination of practices and people (Margolis and Pauwels, 2011) all of whom contribute to the official external presentation of the organisation.

Gender diversity in corporate annual reports

Unlike websites, corporate annual reports are public documents produced largely as a response to the mandatory reporting requirements that exist in most Western countries (Benschop and Meihuizen, 2002; Jancsary et al., 2016), the UK being no exception. For instance, with regard to gender diversity all quoted companies are subject to a requirement under section 414C(8) of the Companies Act 2006 to provide a breakdown of the number of men and women on their board, in senior management positions and in the company as a whole in their annual reports. This requirement, which came into effect in 2013 by way of an amendment to the 2006 Act (Gov.uk, 2013a; Gov.uk, 2013b), followed on from a recommendation in the 2011 Davies report for quoted companies to "disclose each

year the proportion of women on the board, women in Senior Executive positions and female employees in the whole organisation" (Davies, 2011: 19). The 2016 UK Corporate Governance Code also requires listed companies to provide a description of the board's policy on diversity, including gender, any measurable objectives that it has set for implementing the policy, and progress on achieving the objectives in the annual report (Financial Reporting Council, 2016).

However, annual reports do far more than simply comply with legal requirements in that they allow companies to talk about their history, mission, areas of operation and current strategy in terms of financial performance. Increasingly they also allow them to provide an account of themselves along social dimensions (Jancsary et al., 2016), thereby projecting a particular discursive image about what they ostensibly stand for in terms of the "things said" (Foucault, 1991a: 63). As mentioned earlier, Cukier et al (2017) found a discursive shift from ethics to diversity management and the business case in their study of Canadian federal government annual reports on employment equity from 1988 to 2013, coinciding with a shift from equal opportunities to diversity in the UK over a similar period (Brewis, 2017; Lorbiecki and Jack, 2000; Oswick and Noon, 2014), which I describe more fully in the next chapter. Given that they communicate more than just factual data, annual reports can therefore be said to serve the dual function of provider of information and representation of corporate identity (Benschop and Meihuizen, 2002).

In terms of their production, annual reports are usually crafted by executive management and communication experts, apart from reports from the Chief Executive Officer, Chief Finance Officer and the chairs of the various committees (Gray, 2018), although even these reports may be drafted in the first instance by another member of staff. They are directed at what might be called "qualified

audiences" (Jancsary et al., 2016: 193) with varying interests such as financial analysts, regulators, journalists and researchers. As such, they aim to shape their "qualified public's perception" (Jancsary et al., 2016: 193) through a combination of facts and figures reinforced by visual elements such as graphs, charts and figures alongside messages about the company's commitment to social responsibility and so forth. The extent of their interest in and commitment to gender diversity is, however, open to question, in that it is generally contained in a few paragraphs or less within a report that can be up to several hundred pages long.

Additional secondary material

In addition to gathering corporate data in the form of online diversity statements and annual reports, I undertook searches of reports and studies sponsored by the government into women on the boards of FTSE companies by using the search terms: "government", "women", "women on boards", "boards", "women leaders"; "gender diversity" and "business case for diversity". I searched the websites of other organisations such as the Confederation of British Industry (CBI), the Chartered Management Institute, the 30% Club (an independent organisation with the goal of achieving a minimum of 30% women on FTSE 100 boards) and Business in the Community (a charity promoting responsible business) using the search terms "women", "women on boards", "boards", "women leaders", "gender diversity", "gender pay gap" and "business case for diversity".

As mentioned earlier, I also undertook a Google search of all the companies in my sample using the same terms that I used for searching the company websites and annual reports. In other words - diversity/inclusion/diversity and inclusion; gender/gender pay gap/equal pay; equality; equal opportunities; merit; women (thereby also picking up references to men); and women on boards. I then clicked

into each of the links that appeared on the first page, recognising that those search results emerged from a series of algorithms which reflected my own search history. As such they mirrored my "situated location" (Hesse-Biber and Piatelli, 2007: 497). This search produced a number of articles from external sources such as the Evening Standard, the Guardian, Management Today, People Management, Retail Week and the BBC, among others, which I have included within my data chapter where appropriate. I did not therefore search for data within these particular journals and newspapers (for instance, because they were a specialist paper or because of their political affiliation), but rather I identified media discourses within them in relation to these companies as and when they emerged as part of a more general Google search.

Analysis of images and photographs

There is, of course, more to documentary analysis than just reading and examining text - there are also images and photographs which contribute to maintaining or, in some instances, reinforcing the hierarchical gender order (Benschop and Meihuizen, 2002). Indeed, it has been argued not only that "seeing comes before words", but that it also "establishes our place in the surrounding world" (Berger, 2008: front cover). In other words, it enables us to see or sense the world before we can explain it with words. However, as Berger (2008) goes on to explain, the way in which we see things is affected by what we know and believe with the result that every image embodies a particular way of seeing. There is, therefore, no objective way of viewing an image, any more than there is of achieving an objective standpoint when reading and analysing text, as explained earlier. It follows that both my choice of images as well as my interpretation of them in the next chapter are affected by my own critical standpoint.

As images are visual signs, internet images can be said to represent "virtual visual data" (Baetens and Surdiacourt, 2011: 593) which can be analysed from a critical perspective in much the same way as text. But, as Berger (2008: 1) points out, not only do we have more than one way of seeing, we are also always looking at the relationship between different elements of images that are linked by our own subjective viewpoint in the sense that our vision is "continually moving, continually holding things in a circle around itself". In this way, visual images (like text) create an uncertain, always moving space between what we see and what we know such that the "relation between [them] is never settled" (Berger, 2008: front cover). This movement, therefore, is not something that we can control, and is not necessarily a phenomenon of which we are consciously aware. By virtue of this constant movement, however, what we see is open to interpretation in different ways.

There are, not surprisingly perhaps, different visual research methods, such as visual content analysis, semiotics and discourse analysis (Gray, 2018; Rose, 2016), as well as the mixed method of semiology and discourse analysis known as social semiotic multimodal discourse analysis (Kress, 2012). I adopted the latter in order to understand how visual images, as an additional semiotic category to text, are embedded within the practices of corporations and the ways in which they use those images to exercise power (Kress, 2012; Rose, 2016). As multimodality asserts that language or text is just one of the many resources available for making meaning, it recognises that it is just a partial bearer of the meaning of the textual whole (Kress, 2012). For instance, Elliott and Stead (2018) adopted a multi-modal approach when analysing the gendering of women's leadership roles in the media following the global financial crisis on the basis that analysing text and images separately could not expose the contradictions in the ways that their roles were

portrayed in popular culture. Likewise Maier and Ravazzani (2018) used a multi-modal critical discourse approach to study the discursive strategies that companies relied on to frame diversity in digital contexts. Although their focus was not solely on corporate websites (they also analysed blogs and videos), they argued that this approach allowed them to evaluate the consistency of the different strategies across a range of semiotic modes, not just language.

Overall, my aim was to explore the ways in which representations of gender were constructed in corporate images within the context of websites and annual reports alongside the written text. By adopting this understanding of the partiality of language, researchers can think about images not as a "realm of representation" but rather as a "realm of data" (Emmison, 2004: 249) allowing them to investigate the social and cultural processes that lie behind them. In other words, by going behind the images created by corporate cultural practices particularly those projecting pictures of "happy diversity" (Swan, 2010: 93), researchers can focus on how they produce certain practices that encourage social inclusions and exclusions (Rose, 2016). This approach also complemented the main aim of my thesis, which is to explore whether and/or to what extent essentialist stereotypes perpetuate occupational segmentation. The focus in my data chapter was therefore on the ways in which people are portrayed through visual images (Rose, 2016) set out in documentary artefacts, in particular to explore the ways in which they reinforce the message that management remains a "manly business" (Heilman, 2001: 660).

As part of the discourse analysis of the visual images I also identified inconsistencies in the way that women were represented overall compared to men (Heres and Benschop, 2010), the roles in which they were portrayed, as well as the clothes that they were wearing (Rose, 2016). Similar to Guerrier and Wilson's (2011)

analysis of 28 corporate websites looking at how diversity policies were represented to prospective employees, I found that many of the pages in my sample contained very little (or in some cases no) visual imagery, compared to the annual reports which generally contained multiple photographs.

Stages of data analysis

Before analysing my data sample in the next chapter, it is important to briefly explain the process that I followed in order to do so. This closely mirrors the approach adopted by Berglund et al (2018) who firstly provided a brief literature review, after which they explained the basis of their theoretical framework (postfeminism and entrepreneurship policy underpinned by concepts from feminist theorist Nancy Fraser). This was followed by an explanation of the material and their method which was a Foucauldian discourse analysis. Having identified three thematic areas within the material, they carried out an analysis of those themes guided by the three concepts adopted from Fraser's work. They then identified two discourses centred on the themes which formed the basis of their discussion (Berglund et al., 2018).

The process I adopted therefore follows this approach. Having carried out a literature review located within feminist poststructural organisation studies (reaching out to CMS and CDS) in Chapter Two, I set out my theoretical framework based on Adorno's critique of identity thinking and his theory of negative dialectics, with a specific emphasis on the concepts of categorisation and classification, instrumental reason, exchange value and natural history in Chapter Three. Having established that I am interested in the ways in which discourses structure gendered organisational subjectivities in Chapter Two, I explained in this chapter how a Foucauldian critical discourse analysis of my data can further contribute to an

understanding of how the historical processes of power influence the ways in which subject formation comes about. It is therefore these two concepts (that is, power and subjectivity) on which I draw in Chapter Five in terms of analysing the material from a Foucauldian perspective.

Following the example of Berglund et al (2018), I was then able to start identifying a number of thematic areas (diversity and inclusion; organisational performance; merit, objective criteria and diversity; barriers to empowerment; training/development programmes) out of which three discourses emerged. Firstly, following Ahl (2007), I noted the ways in which women were framed within corporate diversity discourse – firstly as different; secondly, as organisational outsiders; and thirdly as deficient. I then identified some of the assumptions that organisations seem to take for granted about women (Ahl, 2007). For instance, I found that although diversity was assumed to be gender neutral, it was often used as a synonym for gender diversity which in turn applied only to women. Thirdly, I considered some of the contradictions within corporate diversity discourse which included highlighting the tensions between merit and diversity, the ways in which women are simultaneously portrayed as perfect and imperfect subjects and the unique individual versus group categorisation. Finally, I considered how these micro level discourses related to wider discourses such as neo-liberalism and postfeminism at a macro level. Then in Chapter Six, I draw on a number of concepts from Adorno's critique, details of which were set out in Chapter Three, in order to analyse the data further.

It is also necessary at this point to explain the ways in which I organised the material I had collected over the months from approximately April to July 2017 (with the final search using the terms transgender and non-binary carried out in April

2019). Firstly, I prepared the data set by reading through the 30 summary documents I had written (one for each company), which contained material not just from company website pages and annual reports, but also from newspapers, business organisations such as the CBI and voluntary organisations such as Business In the Community, as already explained. Each summary document followed the same format in that it started with a brief overview of the company, followed by a detailed account of my website and Google searches, the search of the annual report and finally a brief description of all the visual images in the annual report and on the website pages. In order to become more familiar with the text in the way that Gray (2018) and others (Braun and Clarke, 2006; Fereday and Muir-Cochrane, 2006) recommend, I then read and re-read the summary documents at least three times in order to identify the issues that were most relevant to answering my overall research questions.

I noticed early on in my analysis that organisations were using the terms "sex" and "gender" interchangeably, indicating that they were equating the object of women's materiality with the concept of gender, the hallmark of identity thinking. I also started to notice the ways in which women were being subjectified within diversity discourse, as set out in detail in the next chapter. Suffice to say here that a strong contradiction started to emerge between the essentialist subject who, on the one hand, is portrayed as being integral to organisational success whilst on the other, she is portrayed as needing to be fixed or mended through the mechanisms of training and/or development programmes. I then defined and refined the themes of analysis many times during the process of writing my discussion chapter (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Finally, I exported the summary documents into NVivo and

created a word cloud which highlighted the most frequently used words, as shown below.

Figure One: NVivo word cloud

In terms of applying Foucault's concepts to the actual process of analysing my data, I focused primarily on his insight that discourses are "practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak" (Foucault, 1972: 49). As his most foundational concept for my purposes, it made sense to draw on it to identify the various practices that the organisations in my data sample had introduced. Once the relevant themes had also been identified, I focused on Foucault's concept of genealogy to help reveal the sub-text within organisational diversity and inclusion discourse.

In summary, I drew on the following aspects of Foucault's philosophy to guide me through the analytical process:

1. The importance of the specific historical context from which corporate diversity emerged. In this case, from equal opportunities and liberal governmentality in the 1960s and 1970s to diversity discourse and neo-

liberal governmentality from the 1980s onwards, as indicated in Chapter Two.

2. The ways in which companies mobilise the diversity discourse to exercise power and control over employees by co-opting them into an ideology that is presented as natural and taken for granted.

3. The ways in which subjects are formed, based on an ideology that represents women as currently excluded from the realms of power but whom companies purportedly want to include.

4. The ways in which corporate diversity discourse supports, as opposed to challenges, the status quo based on an unreflexive assumption that the discursive practices mobilised in corporate diversity discourse can bring about change.

5. The ways in which "buried, subjugated knowledges" (Foucault, 1980: 83) about women can be revealed from "a theoretical, unitary, formal and scientific discourse" (Foucault, 1980: 85), such as merit, as explained in more detail in Chapters Five and Six.

In terms of adopting a methodology in order to apply concepts from Adorno's theory of negative dialectics to the empirical data in Chapter Six, I drew on his technique of immanent critique, bearing in mind the caveats in relation to methodology set out earlier in the chapter (Adorno, 1982). As such, I considered whether and in what ways the object's internal form and meaning contradicted its "dominant or preferred reading" (O'Regan, 2006: 185). By looking at the text immanently (in other words, from within the text itself), I then looked within the data for gaps between the object's preferred idea of itself and how it appeared in practice. O'Regan (2006) suggests that researchers adopt the following steps when

analysing text as critical object which overlaps to a large extent with my Foucauldian analysis:

1. Descriptive: what are the topics and how are they presented?

2. Representative: how is the topic presented visually?

3. Social: what social frameworks or contexts are the texts a part of? What meanings do these suggest?

4.Deconstructive: do any of the above seem to contradict the text's preferred reading and if so, in what way? In addition, what are some of the obstacles (whether structural or otherwise) which might impede the resolution of these contradictions (O'Regan, 2006: 185; Herzog, 2016)?

Given the overlap with CDA I carry out the first three steps in Chapter Five. In terms of the last step this is also undertaken in Chapter Five in terms of my Foucauldian discourse analysis of the data sample at both a micro and macro level. This step is replicated in Chapter Six when I operationalise concepts from Adorno's critique in order to further analyse the data, such as the tendency to classify and categorise, the hallmark of identity thinking. This was not a linear process in that I regularly returned to the data as new questions arose in my mind. In particular, I focused on the essentialism within the business case and the ways in which it has come to be understood as a natural, rather than a social, phenomenon, explained more fully in Chapter Six. It was also at this stage that I started to identify different subject positions in more detail, such as the female subject who is framed as perfect as opposed to the female subject framed as imperfect.

This was, without doubt, a challenging exercise in the sense that I had to constantly be aware of and struggle with my own habit of thinking unreflexively. For instance, by reminding myself that my findings did not have to fit neatly with one

another, as though part of a jigsaw puzzle, but rather that I needed to allow for contradictory findings to emerge and not try to suppress them. To that end, I made a conscious effort to resist the temptation to "construe contradictions from above and to progress by resolving them" (Adorno, 1973: 153) which is what identity thinking encourages us to do. Instead, Adorno reminds us that we should focus on "the inadequacy of thought and thing, to experience it in the thing" (Adorno, 1973: 153). I needed therefore to reflect as much as possible on my own tendency to think in exclusively binary terms (man and woman as opposed to allowing for the possibility of other gender categories to emerge) and the ways in which it affected how I interpreted the data, which leads me onto a brief explanation of how I dealt with the issues of ethics and reflexivity within my research.

Ethics, politics and identity thinking

Although a documentary analysis drawing on publicly available material posted on the internet does not raise obvious issues of ethics to do with consent and privacy, it is nevertheless important that I reflected on the principles that guided my research methodology and ensured it was carried out in a responsible and morally defensible way (Gray, 2018). In terms of the actual process of data collection, I did not alter or paraphrase the material in any way in order to support any of the points that I wanted to make. Equally, of course, I decided which sections of text to include and analyse which again reflected my own personal and political interests. Overall, I found that the documentary material - in its unabridged format – strongly supported the premise of the literature review carried out in Chapter Two which is that corporate diversity discourse is based on essentialist stereotypes.

As mentioned previously, I also recognise that I am not a neutral bystander but rather a researcher whose observations and interpretations are selective and

partial (Gray, 2018). As such, it is important to acknowledge my own "situated location" (Hesse-Biber and Piatelli, 2007: 497) which affected not just the topic I chose to research but also the political lens through which I interpreted it. Likewise, I recognise that this political stance impacted on my analysis of the documentary artefacts in the sense of what I chose to notice and then how I wrote about what I had noticed (Hesse-Biber and Piatelli, 2007). My findings therefore reflect the critical, feminist stance that underpins my epistemological perspective. Far from undermining my findings, however, I hope that being open about my political stance encourages readers to become more aware of the viewpoint from which they are reading the material and the feelings that it generates "in the moment" (Riach, 2009: 358).

Although I analysed corporate diversity discourse through a critical lens, I still have to remember that my own thinking is dominated by identitarian thought, as indicated in the previous section. Recognising that I cannot avoid that type of thinking, I tried to be aware of it particularly when analysing the data that I collected which was almost exclusively of a binary (and therefore identitarian) nature. For instance, despite searching for material relating to gender diversity in order to answer my overall research question about the persistence of gendered occupational segmentation in the UK, I simultaneously needed to be aware of and reflect on the fact that most of the data sourced in relation to my search terms related to women which I then compared to men. As indicated above, this tendency to engage in binary thinking also meant that I initially overlooked the discourse mobilised by companies in relation to transgender equality, not least because it featured mainly on pages relating to LGBTQ+ diversity and not on pages focusing on gender diversity. Although this primarily reflected the tendency of corporations to

classify and categorise and to think in binary terms, I also found myself thinking

mainly in terms of women and men, thereby initially failing to assess what

corporations were saying (if anything) about gender fluidity.

Conclusion

   In the first section of this chapter I explained that I was drawing on

Foucauldian CDA as my methodological approach in two main ways. The first

centred on Foucault's definition of discourses as "practices that systematically form

the objects of which they speak" (Foucault, 1972: 49), thereby providing the main

conceptual framework for analysing my data. The second insight related to

Foucault's critical approach to discourse which he viewed as a vehicle for the

exercise of power and the ways in which it contributes to the formation of subjects,

an important aspect of my analysis in the next chapter. I also explained that, as I am

drawing on Adorno for my theoretical framework, the data is further analysed in

Chapter Six through the mechanism of immanent critique which is mainly concerned

with exploring the relationship between the subject and the object. In the second

part of this chapter, I explained in detail the documentary approach on which I relied

to collect my data, namely webpages and annual reports as well as some

supplementary secondary material, including images and photographs. I justified

this documentary approach on the basis that it allowed me to focus on the discursive

approach that corporations have adopted in relation to diversity.

   In the next chapter I draw on Foucault's theoretical concepts as indicated

above to identify a number of dominant discourses within the webpages and annual

reports that I analysed. In particular, I focus on the ways in which the gender roles of

women are reified within the diversity discourse through the mobilisation of the

essentialist stereotypes that underpin the business case for diversity, as well as

some of the contradictions that these stereotypes generate about women. For instance, on the one hand, their skills and talents are portrayed as crucial to increase corporate performance and profitability (known as the business case), rendering them perfect subjects; whilst on the other they are framed as imperfect subjects who need assistance in the form of career development and networking programmes to give them a helping hand up the corporate ladder.

As a reminder, the following are the research questions guiding my thematic and analytical approach in the next two chapters:

1. Why does gender inequality in the form of gendered occupational segmentation continue to persist in the UK?

2. What are the discursive forms through which organisations articulate their commitment to greater gender equality on their websites and in their annual reports?

3. What insights can be derived from Adorno's critique of identity thinking to explain the persistence of gender inequality in the form of gendered occupational segmentation in the UK?

Chapter Five

Power, merit and subjectivity in corporate diversity discourse

Introduction

As explained in the last chapter, I drew on Foucault's critical discourse analysis (CDA) as the methodological framework with which to explore the discourses identified in the data that I gathered before carrying out my theoretical analysis in Chapter Six based on Adorno's critique of identity thinking. As such, Foucault provided me with the necessary epistemological tools to identify the dominant discourses used by organisations and the ways in which "things said" (Foucault, 1991a: 63) come to be understood and accepted as knowledge (Bacchi and Bonham, 2014). My interest in Adorno, on the other hand, is largely (although not exclusively) an ontological one, helping me to draw out abstract ideas and concepts based on his theory of negative dialectics.

Given my methodological stance, I start this chapter by itemising a number of thematic areas that I identified from my summary documents before analysing in detail the "things" that companies have "said" (and represented visually) about diversity and inclusion. Firstly I show how three corporate discourses within my sample reify women as different, as outsiders and as deficient. Secondly, following the example of Ahl (2007), I explore a number of assumptions that my data suggests that organisations make about diversity. For instance the assumption that diversity does not need to be defined. I then draw out some contradictions that I noted within corporate diversity discourse (O'Regan, 2006), including the ways in which women are subjectified simultaneously as both perfect and imperfect; and the ways in which they are categorised as members of a group despite an emphasis on the unique individual. In the final part of the chapter, I consider the ways in which

these discursive practices are connected at a macro level within the wider political context of neo-liberal governmentality and postfeminism.

As mentioned in Chapter Four, when acknowledging my own "situated location" (Hesse-Biber and Piatelli, 2007: 497), my stance, far from being neutral, is overtly emancipatory. It follows that the themes which I identified (and the discourses which emerged from those themes) are therefore those which resonated with my own political and conceptual interests and supported my line of reasoning as a critical feminist researcher. In other words, they are based on the premise that the concept of essentialism (both biological and cultural) underpins contemporary corporate diversity discourse. As pointed out in Chapter One, these essentialist stereotypes are far from new. It seems counter-productive therefore for organisations to rely on the same stereotypes to argue that they can now resolve the problem of occupational segmentation. Instead I suggest that, by failing to question the assumption that the social is natural, organisations have ended up perpetuating, rather than resolving, the problem. I acknowledge, therefore, that another researcher might well have identified different themes and discourses and drawn out different points of interest from the data that follows.

Five thematic areas

It is clear from other studies that the discourse of diversity has become much more widespread since Singh and Point carried out a CDA of the diversity discourse of the websites of 241 top European companies in 2006. They found that just under three quarters of the sample made some mention of diversity, usually in relation to gender or sex equality as opposed to race or ethnicity (Singh and Point, 2006). Likewise, when Merilainen et al (2009) analysed the websites of the 20 largest Finnish companies, they found that the discourse of diversity and diversity

management was ignored in most corporate websites in favour of a gender equality discourse. By contrast, when Jonsen et al (2019: 3) carried out a cross-cultural examination of the diversity statements on the websites of 75 major companies across five countries (France, Germany, Spain, the UK and the United States) almost a decade later, they found that the discourse of inclusion had become "mainstream". My own empirical data study within the UK reflects that finding in the sense that all 30 companies in my sample referred to diversity and/or inclusion on their websites and/or annual reports.

Although Merilainen et al (2009) analysed "diversity management" as one discourse I identified five thematic areas within the data - diversity and inclusion; organisational performance; merit and objective criteria; barriers to empowerment; and training/development programmes, as I now explain. Perhaps not surprisingly, the theme of "diversity and inclusion" was the most dominant as this constituted the title of most of the website pages where I started my search (although a minority of companies still referred to equality or equal opportunities). In terms of identifying the theme of "organisational performance", this became apparent from a constant re-reading of the summary documents which revealed that, on the whole, companies did not refer to the "business case for diversity" but talked instead about "business", "organisational" or "stock" performance. I therefore decided to combine these terms under the theme of "organisational performance". The themes of "merit and objective criteria" as well as "barriers to empowerment" emerged as a result of the frequency with which they appeared in the data. The final theme reflects the training programmes (such as career development) that companies have introduced ostensibly to help women get to the top. These themes, are, however, as mentioned above, not necessarily neutral in the sense that they support my own

epistemological position, representing the "things said" (Foucault, 1991a: 63) by organisations that I found of interest and which I identified as a result of the search terms that I considered to be most relevant to my research questions.

Discourses reifying women

In order to identify relevant discourses from the text and images in my sample, I drew heavily on Foucault's understanding of the term as "practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak" (Foucault, 1972: 49) with a particular emphasis on the concepts of power and subjectivity. Given that, in Foucault's terminology, discourses are practices, it may seem tautological to refer in this and other chapters to discourses as well as discursive practices. I do so, however, in order to differentiate between discourses as "specific knowledges" and discursive practices as "practices *of discourses*" (Bacchi and Bonham, 2014: 174, italics in the original). As this thesis explores whether and to what extent gendered occupational segmentation in the UK is underpinned by essentialist assumptions, I therefore focused on the discourses that would help me to answer that question. In terms of discursive practices, I have interpreted them as meaning the text and images that the companies in my sample mobilised on their website pages and in their annual reports.

Following the example of Ahl (2007) and Berglund et al (2018), I now consider the ways in which the five thematic areas (diversity and inclusion; organisational performance; merit and objective criteria; barriers to empowerment; training/development programmes) already identified from the summary documents can be understood as constitutive of a number of analytically distinct but empirically related discourses which reify women. Identifying these entailed a long analytical process in which I first ordered the material I had gathered under the thematic

headings themselves. I then read and re-read the text and studied the images repeatedly, paying attention to the ways in which corporations discursively constructed women's organisational subjectivities as a way of exercising power. In particular, I looked for examples which highlighted how corporations "positioned" women differently to men (Ahl, 2007: 220), such that they reified women as a group with certain essential, innate qualities.

Given the emphasis on difference within the literature (Ahonen et al., 2014; Holck et al., 2016; Lorbiecki and Jack, 2000; Mease and Collins, 2018), I began by looking for practices that framed women as different. In other words, practices that framed women as having certain essential qualities that differed from those of men, reflecting the notion of "female talent" (Davies, 2015: 18) and "women's skills" (Hampton-Alexander Review, 2016: 10) that lies at the heart of the business case. This emphasis on difference then led me to think about the representation of women in terms of the jobs they do compared to men and whether they were generally represented as being at different organisational levels to men, thereby framing them as members who do not belong or as Benschop (2002: 628) puts it, as "organisational outsiders". I then started to consider the presence of other practices that might exclude women, such as the range of programmes and policies that companies claim to have introduced in order to help these "outsider" women to the top. Rather than reinforcing their status as organisational outsiders, however, I suggest in this part of my analysis that these practices have another function which is to frame women as deficient. As my analysis showed these discourses to be separate (albeit closely empirically related with one another), I decided to present my findings under these three discrete headings. They are explained in detail in the

next section of this chapter where I provide specific examples to substantiate each of my findings.

That is not to say that women were always - or only - discursively constructed in these ways but rather that these portrayals stood out as particularly relevant for the purpose of the thesis. I am not therefore suggesting that every piece of text about women or every image of women on the corporate website pages and in the annual reports of the companies in my sample fitted only under these particular discursive headings. Likewise, some of the examples that I identified in this chapter could have been allocated under more than one of the three headings. For instance, the image in Figure Ten (page 198) could have fitted under either the heading of women as organisational outsiders or under women as deficient. Ultimately I decided it lent itself more to the latter, although another researcher may well have decided differently. However, this question of which discursive heading was the more appropriate did not detract from my aim in this chapter which was to explore whether and in what ways the combined effects of the three discourses that I identified from my sample of corporate websites and annual reports constructed women in essentialist terms.

Again following the example of Ahl (2007) and Berglund et al (2018), I then examined some of the assumptions underpinning corporate diversity discourse. As Ahl (2007) explains, the logic of discourse analysis is predicated on the notion that underlying assumptions reside by definition under the text. These hidden statements indicate that there must be a discourse that can be drawn on. Otherwise how else were they produced? Although another researcher may have identified other assumptions from my sample, I focused on two in particular which stood out for me from the text and images - that diversity does not need to be defined and that

diversity is gender neutral. As discussed in Chapter Two, these assumptions have been the focus of analysis of other critical diversity scholars, who have pointed out that the failure to define diversity allows organisations to interpret it in whatever way they want (Brewis, 2019; Heres and Benschop, 2010; Stockdale et al., 2018). This understanding then led me to look for other "points of diffraction" (Foucault, 1972: 65) within the material to identify contradictions that appear as points of incompatibility. Again, the contradictions that I identified – such as the way in which women are subjectified as simultaneously both perfect and imperfect – are not exhaustive and another researcher, asking different questions, would likely have found others. In the next chapter, I examine how these discourses operate in combination and how they relate to identity thinking, thereby helping to answer my three research questions.

Finally in this chapter, I show how some of these discourses are reflected at the macro level through the mobilisation of concepts such as the business case which have become accepted as common sense (a point to which I also return in more detail in the next chapter). This concept, in turn, represents a shift from a liberal to neo-liberal governmentality in the 1980s which impacted on the ways that gender roles are reproduced and reinforced within organisations. Within corporate diversity discourse, this is manifested as a shift from the principle of social justice underpinning equal opportunities to the ethos of instrumental reasoning as the guiding principle underpinning diversity discourse, as discussed later in the chapter.

Reification of gender roles

a) Discourses framing women as different

Of the 30 companies in my sample, 20 referred to the importance of the unique or individual qualities that employees could potentially bring to their business. Indeed, the whole concept of diversity and inclusion is premised on the notion that everyone is different although this difference is never actually defined. The result of this approach is that the link between the person and the group is taken so much for granted that the so-called diverse employee is not positioned as an individual, but as a member of the group that they represent (Dennissen et al., 2018b; Zanoni and Janssens, 2004). In effect, they become the repository of an essential identity revealing who is being categorised as having a different identity category as opposed to those who are included and welcomed (Dennissen et al., 2018b; Zanoni et al., 2010). In other words, it is premised on group difference. As I consider further in the next chapter, this discourse framing women as different to men also has the effect of undermining the notion that difference – as opposed to sameness - lies at the heart of corporate diversity discourse. Instead, as Christensen and Muhr (2018: 126) point out, if women's differences "become alike" then women as a group must be the same.

Underpinning this approach, 19 organisations made clear that they support diversity specifically because having more women in senior management or on their board would improve organisational performance. As explained earlier in the chapter, although corporate discourse was framed in the language of the business case, the organisations in my sample tended not to use this term. Likewise, although none of the companies indicated what different qualities women, as women, could bring to the board to ensure its success, there was an assumed link between these

unnamed qualities (which presumably were different to those of men) and increased profitability. For instance, Unilever asserts that "if you invest in women, you often get a higher return" (Huffington Post, 2016: webpage). This discourse, which is often referred to as "the business case for diversity" as explained in Chapter Two, is now "so obvious …. [that] it's a no brainer", according to the Director of Women in Leadership for Sky plc (Changing People, 2015: webpage). Indeed, she asks "why wouldn't you do this? It's good for your business, it's good for your financial returns. And, it's also the right thing to do – who wouldn't support a move to ensure equality of opportunity" (Changing People, 2015: webpage). In other words, the business case is predicated on the notion that women are different to men on the basis that they have "female talent" (Davies, 2015: 18) and "women's skills" (Hampton-Alexander Review, 2016: 10).

Women were further identified as different to men in terms of the potential barriers that they face. However, these were not defined by the companies in my sample in the sense that they were simply referred to as "barriers" without explaining what they might be. As such, they could be a reference to structural problems, such as the gender pay gap; or a reference to women's perceived inadequacies, such as a lack of confidence and/or ambition. Alternatively they could be cultural barriers such as presenteeism; or a reference to discrimination. Cukier et al (2017: 1051) suggest that using an "elusive expression" such as "barriers" represents a way of justifying the slow progress being made towards greater numbers of women on boards and in senior management. Indeed they noted an increasing use of terms such as "exclusion" and "barriers" (Cukier et al., 2017: 1051) in their study of the annual reports of the Canadian Employment Equity Act from 1988 to 2013 and a decrease in references to sexism, racism and discrimination.

Conversely, I found very few overt references to women's caring responsibilities as a potential barrier, with the exception of Marks & Spencer which admitted that "at management level less than 5% of those on flexible working arrangements are male" (M&S, 2017: webpage), meaning that 95% of those who work flexibly at this level are women. This failure to acknowledge the extent of women's caring responsibilities was reinforced by an image on Centrica's website entitled "Balancing Work and Family Commitments", showing an image of a man with a young boy engrossed in an activity together (Centrica plc, 2014). The image, which features the pair sitting close together on a sofa, seems to be an attempt to challenge the stereotype of women as the natural carers of children, despite the fact that, statistically, they continue to carry out more domestic work than men (Lyonette and Crompton, 2014), and spend more than twice as much time caring for children compared to men (Government Equalities Office, 2018b; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2016). Despite purporting to acknowledge the barriers facing women at work, therefore, the discourse of women as different ignored the most obvious barrier that prevents them from operating more like the "ideal worker" (Benschop and Van den Brink, 2018: 2; Cha, 2013: 161), thereby stopping them from operating more like men.

Figure Two: Man and boy, Centrica webpage entitled "Caring for our people with carer responsibilities"

Unilever, on the other hand, stood out in terms of acknowledging the ways in which stereotypes can limit expectations of what women (again presumably as opposed to men) can do. On a page on its website entitled "Persil", it claimed that the brand had long played a part in challenging such stereotypes - from helping to abolish "wash day" at the turn of the century, which radically changed women's roles "to being the first laundry detergent to feature a man in their TV advertising, breaking down gender stereotypes" (Unilever plc, Undated: webpage). In 2016 it launched an initiative entitled "Unstereotype" to "advance portrayals" of women and men in its advertising (Unilever, Undated: webpage). On a webpage entitled "Challenging harmful gender stereotypes", a man is duly portrayed washing clothes, with a smiling woman at his side (Figure Three). There is no accompanying text to explain where the photo has been taken, but the inference seems to be that men (or at least men from developing countries) can even handwash, as opposed to just putting clothes into a washing machine. However, he seems to be the only man

engaged in this activity in the photograph which rather undermines the point it is trying to make.

Figure Three: Image from Unilever webpage entitled "Challenging harmful gender norms"

In line with this approach, Unilever also vowed in 2016 to drop all sexist stereotypes from its own advertising after research suggested just 2% of ads showed intelligent women (Guardian, 2016: webpage). The following year, it joined UN Women in its Unstereotype Alliance to use the power of advertising to challenge stereotypical portrayals of people (Unilever, Undated). Then in 2017, it carried out research for the Economic Forum in Davos, urging the world's most senior leaders to recognise that stereotypes, social norms and unconscious bias were contributing to the ever-widening gender gap (Unilever plc, 2017: webpage). The problem is, however, that despite this awareness of the dangers posed by stereotypes promoting the idea women have certain qualities which are inherently different to men, the company continues to support the business case which is, itself, predicated on the very stereotypes that it purports to want to eradicate (Huffington Post, 2016: webpage). In other words, there seems to be a gap between the rhetoric

of diversity discourse in the form of the text and images which companies mobilise and practices such as the business case which so many of them endorse.

b) Discourses framing women as organisational outsiders

The stereotypes which flow from a discourse that articulates women as different also contribute to the discursive construction of women as organisational outsiders. Indeed, as indicated earlier in the chapter, I acknowledge the extent to which they are empirically related. However, from an analytical perspective, I would suggest that they are distinct, as explained in this section . A good example is highlighted in the photograph below taken from the 2016 annual report of the mining company, Fresnillo (Figures Four and Five). This shows a young woman wearing overalls, safety glasses and a hard hat, suggesting that not only does she work for an industry that is very male-dominated (only 8.5% of Fresnillo's employees were women in 2016), but that the actual work she does is of a technical nature and therefore linked to a stereotypically male occupation within mining. The overall semiotic message that the image seems to be projecting is that the company wants to empower young women to pursue a career in the mining industry working alongside men. However, the message is simultaneously undermined by the signifier of the pink hard hat which she is wearing and her overalls, which are open at the neck. She also seems to be wearing lipstick and has a pink pen sticking out from her top pocket. Although she may have the same skills as a man, these signifiers combine together to connote her as the outsider.

Figures Four and Five: Woman in pink hard hat and overalls; man in white hard hat and shirt, Fresnillo annual report 2016, pages 30 and 38

This interpretation is reinforced by the fact that 19 of the images in Fresnillo's annual report and its diversity webpage show men in hard hats, safety glasses and overalls standing close to mining shafts and quarries. In contrast there is only one other photograph of a woman in a hard hat and overalls (Figure Six). Although she is photographed in a technical setting, inferring that she has a technical (male) job, her overalls look new as do the hard hat and the pink and blue pens peeping out from the top of her overalls pocket. It is unclear whether she is wearing face makeup and/or lipstick but the overall impression created is of a person who is not used to engaging in messy or dirty work and therefore does not belong in the mining industry.

Figure Six: Woman in hard hat and overalls, Fresnillo diversity webpage

Likewise, Glencore (a commodity producer and trader, 17% of whose employees were women in 2016) colour-coded its helmets connoting woman as the "Other" by virtue of the pink hard hat they were portrayed as wearing compared to the blue one for men (Figures Seven and Eight). As in Figure Four, the woman in Figure Eight is much younger than the man who, by virtue of his age, suggests knowledge and experience, indicating that women are viewed as very much the junior party in the company hierarchy. This image is reinforced by the fact that she is a woman of colour, compared to the man who is white.

Figures Seven and Eight: Man in blue hard hat; woman in pink hard hat, Glencore annual report 2016, pages 1 and 3

Although other companies showed women in overalls, hard hats and hi-viz jackets such as Babcock International, Centrica, Diageo and Unilever, these very much reflected a standard uniform within these types of organisations. For instance, four companies – Astrazeneca, Babcock International, Mediclinic and Unilever – showed multiple photographs of women employees wearing lab coats and safety glasses. Indeed, like Singh and Point (2006: 373), I found that the visual images on both the webpages and in the annual reports revealed a discourse of the "desirable diverse employee", often a young, smiling, Asian female scientist as shown in the photograph below (Figure Nine), taken from Diageo's diversity and inclusion webpages (Diageo, Undated-a). According to a photo analysis of portrayals of male and female employees in annual reports, male executives are much less likely to be photographed while smiling than female executives. As such, smiling is interpreted

as a symbolic connotation of power with the submissive member smiling more and the dominant person smiling less (Anderson and Imperia, 1992), thereby increasing the perception of their competence and credibility (Salminen et al., 2019).

Figure Nine: Woman in lab coat, Diageo diversity and inclusion webpage

However, despite these attempts - whether conscious or otherwise - by companies to portray women as organisational insiders, the overwhelming images in the annual reports were of white men whose professional identities were based on rigid views of masculinity, reflected in their "understated" clothing – mostly suits, shirts and ties (Barry, 2018: 640). This was particularly the case in relation to photographs of members of the boards of directors where the men were (not surprisingly) very much in the majority, albeit supplemented by a minority of women, again reflecting a very binary view of the world. Given the predominance of images of men, they were again generally portrayed as organisational insiders, whereas women were shown in more diverse roles, sometimes representing organisational insiders in the sense of being on the inside in terms of power, but more often outsiders in terms of their organisational status (Benschop and Meihuizen, 2002). As indicated earlier, the colour-coding of the hard hats served to reinforce this notion of

women's inconsistent insider status in the sense that their work clothing (such as overalls) suggested they were insiders while the pink hard hats marked them as outsiders.

c) Discourses framing women as deficient

As other scholars have found (Dennissen et al., 2018b; Mease and Collins, 2018; Tatli, 2011), group-based differences are still the overwhelming driver of organisational diversity policies, despite a continued emphasis by corporations on the supposed unique qualities of the diverse individual. Likewise, I found in my sample that the discourse of diversity and inclusion articulated by companies was overwhelmingly driven by group-based differences, but only in relation to women, not men. For instance, 22 of the 30 companies offered training programmes specifically aimed at women as a group. These were designed to help women build confidence (Centrica, Old Mutual, Royal Mail); to provide women with mentors (Diageo, Land Securities, Marks & Spencer); and/or provide them with networking opportunities (Centrica, Intercontinental Hotels Group, Kingfisher, Marks & Spencer).

Almost half the companies in my sample also offered women specific training programmes to help their career development. For instance, Coca-Cola offered personal development planning for women, Legal & General offered workshops to help women drive their careers forward, Merlin's women's group aimed to help women develop into senior roles while Royal Mail wanted to ensure that female staff were supported in terms of their professional development. Given that these programmes and policies were only on offer to women, they support the notion that they need help to get to the top, thereby highlighting their deficiencies as opposed to men who presumably already possess the abilities that companies are seeking.

Likewise, the numerical targets for women's representation set by 12 of the 30 companies in my sample to increase the number of women at senior management level or on the board serve a similar function.

This assumption that women need help to get to the top was further articulated by a photo (Figure Ten) in the 2016 annual report of Coca-Cola HBC AG of a young white woman in an unidentified street, circled by the CEO and five other white men in suits looking on while the CEO appears to be explaining a point to her while she smiles attentively (Coca-Cola HBC AG, 2016). Her casual clothes which display her legs, thereby linking her femininity to informality, reinforce her more junior status. The men, on the other hand, are in suits, shirts and ties reinforcing the message that they are serious and official company representatives, whereas women are not. As the image of a young woman with older men connotes a lack of experience, the semiotic message here seems to be that not only are most senior managers men, management remains a manly/masculine business (Gipson et al., 2017; Heilman, 2001; Stoker et al., 2012). This impression was reinforced by the fact that she is encircled by the men, all of whom are taller than her. It is unclear why they are standing in the middle of what looks like a public thoroughfare, not least because the section of the report in which this photo appears is entitled "Managing risk and materiality", with a sub-title of "Taking proactive measures to create and protect value". The woman is portrayed with a smile on her face, connoting a submissive position, compared to the CEO who is not only unsmiling, but is portrayed as making a serious point by virtue of the fact that he is gesticulating with both hands (Anderson and Imperia, 1992).

Figure Ten: Woman encircled by men in street, Coca-Cola HBC AG 2016 annual report, page 16

The notion of female deficiency was further reinforced by comments from some of the very few female FTSE 100 CEOs at the time of carrying out the research. For instance, the then Kingfisher CEO Veronique Laury talked about "women limiting themselves" (Mail on Sunday, 2018: webpage); while the then Royal Mail chief executive Moya Greene said that women needed to be more courageous and "take the risky jobs" (Management Today, 2016: webpage). This inference that women themselves are to blame for their failure to get to the top because of a lack of confidence or a resistance to risk reflects the classic postfeminist attitude that, as active subjects, women are personally responsible for their own empowerment and therefore their own success and failure (Adamson, 2017). For instance, Adamson

(2017) found in her research on the autobiographies of four celebrity female CEOs the idea that any and all barriers could be surmounted by women if they could only learn to self-manage more effectively. As Rottenberg (2014: 420) points out, this so-called "ambition gap" calls into being a subject who is compelled to conform to the norms of the market while at the same time assuming responsibility for her own well-being.

Likewise, women were discursively constructed as being responsible for the gender pay gap. According to the Equality Act 2010 (Gender Pay Gap Information) Regulations 2017 which came into force in April 2018, all organisations in the UK with more than 250 employees have to carry out an annual gender pay gap audit, the results of which must be posted on the relevant government website. Alongside the headline figures, contributing companies are encouraged to publish supporting narratives to account for the gap. The overwhelming reason given by the companies in my data sample which published narratives was the high number of men in senior roles. For instance, Whitbread stated that if it applied a 50:50 gender mix across the grades, the pay gap would effectively disappear (Whitbread plc, 2018). Likewise, Inmarsat argued that if it had an equal gender proportion at each organisational level, their gender pay gap would reduce to 6.4% compared to 21.9% currently (Inmarsat plc, 2019). The problem therefore stemmed from the failure of women themselves to be promoted into the top jobs. It follows that if women had the necessary skills and competences, these companies would not have a gender pay gap problem. In other words, if women were not so deficient, the gender pay gap would not exist.

Assumptions underpinning diversity discourse

As explained in Chapter Four, Foucault was not just interested in one practice, but rather wanted to explore and understand the effect of "a regime of practices" by which he meant "places where what is said and what is done, rules imposed and reasons given, the planned and the taken for granted meet and interconnect" (Foucault, 1991b: 75). Following Ahl's (2007) example, I have taken this to mean that I should look for ideas or assumptions in my data sample that are taken for granted about diversity by organisations. In the next section, therefore, I have identified two assumptions that may appear neutral, but which have an impact on the way women are discursively constructed within diversity discourse, as explained in the previous section. These are by no means exhaustive and another researcher might well have identified other assumptions.

a) Diversity does not need to be defined

All 30 companies in my sample referred to diversity and/or inclusion, with the relevant policy set out on a specific webpage or in a dedicated policy document. Interestingly, as other scholars have found (Brewis, 2019; Christensen and Muhr, 2018; Heres and Benschop, 2010; Stockdale et al., 2018), none of them offered a definition of what they meant by the terms although they made frequent references to diversity in its "broadest" or "widest" sense. For instance, Hammerson recorded its intention in its 2016 annual report to take into account "diversity in its widest sense" with regard to filling vacancies on its board (Hammerson plc, 2016: 73); while Marks & Spencer claimed to have due regard for "diversity in its widest definition" when appointing members to its board (M&S, 2016: 38).

Given this failure to define what they mean, corporations have been able to stretch the definition of diversity further and further, taking into account increasingly "trivial" characteristics such as "talkativeness" and "lifestyle" (Oswick and Noon,

2014: 25). For instance, in my sample 3i Group referred to the need for companies to attract staff with a diverse range of qualities including skills and professional backgrounds (3i Group plc, 2016: 62), while Antofagasta stressed the need for diversity of thought, views and attitudes (Antofagasta Minerals, 2015: 92). For its part, Babcock International made clear that, for them, diversity includes experiences, opinions and values (Babcock International Group plc, Undated: unnumbered).

This assumption that there is no need to define what is meant by diversity and/or inclusion may be no coincidence, however, because in the absence of a definition, it can mean whatever organisations want it to mean. As Ahonen et al (2014: 272) point out, this allows "[d]iversity [to] become everything and nothing, a signifier without a signified", making it difficult for companies to be held to account. As a consequence of its status as an "empty signifier" (Christensen and Muhr, 2018: 127), diversity can therefore be different from what it appears to be. Indeed, as I discuss in the next chapter, empty signifiers can contain and express any number of possible definitions. Christensen (2018) has analysed this failure to define diversity as an emptiness or lack representing the void that lies at the heart of diversity, a point to which I return in more detail in the next chapter.

Even more worryingly, if diversity is not "tied down" as a concept or is not understood to mean something "in particular", people can then define it in such a way that might "actually block action" (Ahmed, 2007: 240), a point I also develop further in the next chapter. In particular, I argue that this failure to define diversity has the effect of facilitating a type of discursive closure which mitigates against greater gender equality precisely because it allows organisations to present a lack of progress as the result of the innate deficiencies of women. It is also worth noting the

similarity of the language mobilised by the companies in this regard, particularly the references to diversity in its "broadest sense". Indeed, it is precisely this type of "unitary, formal and scientific discourse" (Foucault, 1980: 85) which tries to present itself as a form of "true knowledge" (Foucault, 1980: 83) that Foucault wanted to challenge.

b) Diversity is gender neutral

Although all 30 companies in my sample referred to diversity and/or inclusion, either on a specific webpage or in a dedicated policy document as though it were gender neutral, I found that it was often used as a synonym for gender diversity which in turn applied only to women. For instance, out of the 30 companies, 19 focused solely on women within the text on their webpages relating to gender diversity policies and practices, indicating that only women (not men) have gender. Indeed, when men were featured within corporate diversity pages, it was overwhelmingly in a management capacity.

Take Old Mutual as a good example. In a document entitled "Inclusion, diversity and the gender pay gap", the company referred solely to gender diversity which related only to women. As such, the company refers to its commitment as a "proud signatory to HM Treasury Women in Finance Charter" as well as the targets it set for "gender balance in senior management; a minimum of 35%, but aiming for 40% of senior management being female by the end of 2020" (Old Mutual plc, Undated: 4). Likewise, on a page relating to Diageo's inclusion in the Bloomberg Gender Equality Index, the company referred solely to its performance "as a result of our representation of women within the business … as well as our wider initiatives to ensure women are empowered throughout our supply chain and beyond" (Diageo, 2018b: webpage). In addition, the vast majority of the references to gender

diversity in corporate annual reports were references to women, particularly in the sections setting out the number of women on the company's board and in senior management. Although the figures for men were also given, these acted as a yardstick against which increases in the number of women could be measured, reinforcing the overwhelming perception of a binary view of gender within corporate diversity discourse.

This conflation of gender diversity with women is reinforced by some of the images on corporate diversity website pages. For instance, although the male co-chair of the Marks & Spencer Gender Equality Network (previously entitled the Inspiring Women's Network) insisted that this is not "a female only issue" (M&S, 2017), the image below (Figure Eleven) tells a different story. It is presumably no coincidence that the seven women in the photograph are situated in his orbit, putting him centre stage so that he is framed by them. He is dressed very formally in a suit, shirt and tie, connoting his senior corporate status; whereas the women are much more informally dressed, thereby connoting their more junior status. The message "Be bold for change" infers not only that M&S wants change and is bold in its approach to achieving it, but also that if women want change, they too must be bold, reinforcing the neo-liberal message that women are responsible for the change they want to see in the world. It is also worth noting that, despite the name change, the image on the webpage shows that the only members of the group are women, apart from the co-chair.

Figure Eleven – Image from Marks & Spencer Gender Equality Network webpage

Likewise, Diageo Colombia recently celebrated coming fifth out of 209 companies in the region for "its initiatives to reduce gender inequality and champion diversity within the organisation" (Diageo, 2018a). Despite the reference in the heading to gender equality, the text on the page refers solely to women which included coming first in the Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report for 2018 in terms of the number of women directors on its board (Diageo, 2018a).

Figure Twelve: Diageo webpage entitled "Diageo Colombia ranked fifth in the PAR: Ranking of Gender Equality in Organisations"

As with the Marks & Spencer example, this image reinforces the focus on women that was apparent from the text. Firstly, there is only one man in the photograph, and although he is not placed directly in the centre, he is the tallest in the group and the eye is drawn to him before panning out to the women standing on either side of him. Secondly, although his outfit is casual in the sense that he is not wearing a tie, he still articulates a dominant managerial authority when compared with the much more casual dress code of the other members of the group (Barry, 2018). Thirdly, in terms of body language, his arms appear to be extended out behind the women on either side of him, showing his power and authority whereas the body language of the women in the group is much more submissive and therefore indicative of their deference to him.

What is striking about the two images is the similarity between the ways in which the women are framed as peripheral to the main focus - the man. Although neither of the two men is identified formally as a manager, the image projects the assumption that as men, they are the centre of attention. These images therefore

seem to have two main messages. Firstly that there is a hierarchy, with men at the top and women lower down the rankings which, we are also led to assume from the photographs, is the natural order of things. In other words, that it is natural for managers to be male and women to be subordinate because of their innate, essential qualities. The second is that, by virtue of that hierarchy, women cannot make it to the top on their own, given their natural deficiencies. In other words, although diversity discourse is portrayed as gender neutral, the assumptions underpinning it reflect a corporate "reality" which positions women as having certain qualities as a group which determine their status as inferior to that of men. This discourse is, however, far from straightforward and in some instances, is contradicted by other corporate discourses, which I now consider.

Contradictions within diversity discourse

Although Foucault acknowledged that the process of analysing discourses involved hiding and revealing contradictions within them, he emphasised that this approach should not be interpreted as meaning that they were "appearances to be overcome, nor secret principles to be uncovered". Instead he made clear that "they are objects to be described for themselves" (Foucault, 1972: 151). In this section, therefore, I identify and describe a number of contradictions that I found within my sample of corporate diversity discourse not in order to "overcome" them (Foucault, 1972: 151), but rather to highlight Butler's (1990) dialectical point that women's under-representation in the top jobs is discursively constituted by the very diversity discourse that is supposed to bring it about.

a) Merit and objective criteria

Almost half the companies in my sample copied the phrase "on merit, against objective criteria and with due regard for the benefits of diversity" almost verbatim

from the pages of the UK Corporate Governance Code (Financial Reporting Council, 2016: 11). They did not, however, explain what they meant by "the benefits of diversity" nor how those benefits fitted with the aspirations implicit within merit and objective criteria. Nor did they explain how they juggled these different criteria as part of their board recruitment and/or promotion processes. Likewise, they did not explain how they applied the objective criteria to which they referred alongside "due regard" for diversity, a concept which itself was not defined, an indication that the entire phrase is yet another example of an "empty signifier" (Christensen and Muhr, 2018: 127). Much like their failure to define diversity and inclusion, therefore, this vagueness may serve to remove accountability from organisations if they do not deliver greater equality for women.

Although diversity and merit were sometimes framed as synonymous with one another, the organisations in my sample were more likely to present them as conflicting with each other, thus promoting the view that diverse candidates are not necessarily the most meritorious candidates. For instance, Fresnillo stated that although it was committed to diversity, "skills and merit must remain the key criteria for employment and career development decisions" (Fresnillo plc, 2016: 94). And although Paddy Power Betfair was prepared to give "due regard to gender diversity" it also made clear that "all appointments are based on merit" (Paddy Power Betfair plc, 2016: 74).

In order to explore this apparent paradox, I focus in this section on revealing the gaps between merit's preferred idea of itself and how it operates in practice in order to highlight the ways in which it contradicts its "dominant or preferred reading" (O'Regan, 2006: 185). The first reading seems to indicate that diversity can operate in conjunction with merit. However, this interpretation is undermined by a second

analysis whereby merit is still presented as an objective measure but this time in opposition to diversity. This view, to which most of the organisations in my sample adhered, seems to infer that diversity is not objective in that those who satisfy merit and the objective criteria that are said to underpin it are those who deserve to get the top jobs. In other words, those who make it to the top do so as a result of their individual merit, an approach that represents a micro, organisational-level articulation of the macro-discursive influence of neo-liberalism and postfeminism which I consider in a later section.

The problem, of course, is that merit can be defined as "whatever it is that is required to be successful" which means that those who have been successful can "claim to have (and thus determine) merit" (Sealy, 2010: 185). In other words, merit standards are subjective, not objective, developed over time by members of powerful social groups. By overlooking that history, corporations are able to present merit as an ahistorical, objective measure of ability (Roithmayr, 1997), while simultaneously concealing the effects of disciplinary power in shaping the subject of social practices informed by merit. In this way merit can be facilitated as a discourse which is separate from structures of power, status, and influence (Sommerlad, 2015), thereby reinforcing the notion that men deserve to be appointed to high status jobs while women do not, as men have proven themselves to have merit.

Indeed, the rationale behind the diversity argument in general (and that of the business case specifically) implicitly accepts that the merit principle is flawed because if people are already appointed on merit, then the best person for the job must invariably be appointed. If the successful candidates are mostly men, it follows that women must be less competent in terms of their skills and talent. In other words, if merit and objective criteria have already been applied, the benefits of

diversity seem to serve no purpose apart from operating as a concealed source of regulatory power. However, if the merit principle is flawed because of, say, unconscious bias, then the reason for the lack of women in the top jobs is because of discrimination within the system. If that is the case, then it needs to be tackled directly as opposed to being subsumed within a discourse that presents everyone as individuals with their own unique characteristics. As such, it does not make sense for companies to claim (as they do) that they appoint on merit, against objective criteria, whilst at the same time subscribing to the business case for diversity.

b) Perfect and imperfect subjects

As indicated in Chapter Four, Foucault's main goal was not to perfect an analysis of power/knowledge but rather it was to understand the ways in which human beings are made into subjects in our culture (Foucault, 1982). He was particularly interested in the process whereby individuals internalise the "power of the norm" (Foucault, 1995: 184). As such, he was interested in the process of "subjectification" or being made "subject to someone else" (Foucault, 1982: 781). Although Foucault argues that power is not hierarchical and that individuals are "the vehicles of power" rather than its victims (Foucault, 1980: 98), the dominance of men in positions of power within organisations (amongst other institutions) from which women are all too often excluded, would seem to suggest otherwise. This implies that although it can be said that power *should not* be hierarchical, it seems difficult to substantiate the argument that it *is* not.

As discussed earlier, feminists have argued that Foucault's analysis fails to appreciate the significance of gender in the play of power and the systematic nature of gender oppression (Deveaux, 1994; Hartsock, 1990; King, 2004). Having said that, however, Foucault's understanding of the way in which power produces certain

types of subjects facilitated my analysis that corporate diversity discourse generates two different, subject positions for women. Although Foucault has, in turn, been criticised for creating subjects who cannot resist power (Hartsock, 1990), Butler (1990a) has conversely argued that his insights highlight a fascinating paradox – that is, that the subjection of women is discursively constituted by the system that is supposed to emancipate them. As such, the very stereotypes which have sustained occupational segmentation in the past are now offered up within the business case as a way of resolving it. As I argue in the next chapter, they operate as a type of discursive closure obstructing greater gender inequality rather than helping to bring it about.

This contradiction at the heart of women's subjectivity was reflected clearly in my empirical data which presented women as simultaneously perfect and imperfect subjects. This was done in two ways that are separate but related. In the first instance, as discussed earlier in this chapter, women were framed as deficient through the operation of a number of different discursive practices. Secondly, by projecting the notion that gender diversity is neutral (despite being applied only to women), it reinforced the idea that women do not have the skills to get to the top on their own, whilst concealing the normalising impact of corporate disciplinary power.

This discourse emphasising women's "lack" (Christensen and Muhr, 2018: 114) seems at odds, however, with the rationale underpinning the business case in which women are lauded for their special "female talent" (Davies, 2015: 18) and "women's skills" (Hampton-Alexander Review, 2016: 10). Although the terms of the business case argument vary, the underpinning premise is that the inclusion of more women on company boards will improve business performance (Villiers, 2010) due to the unique perspectives and knowledge that they are purported to bring

(Teasdale et al., 2012). Despite these assertions, the evidence is far from conclusive as to whether having more women on company boards leads to improved organisational performance, as indicated in Chapter Two (Hoobler et al., 2018). Yet, despite these uncertainties, the business case continues to find strong support among corporations, as evidenced by two thirds of the companies in my data set.

c) Unique versus group categorisation

A third contradiction relates to the repeated references to the unique individual within diversity discourse. Of the 30 companies in my sample, 20 referred to the importance of the unique or individual qualities that employees could potentially bring to their business. For instance, the Admiral Group referred to the "individuality that everyone brings" (Admiral Group, 2017: 5); while Diageo was keen to celebrate the value of the "unique contribution" of each member of staff (Diageo, Undated-b: 1). Indeed, the whole concept of diversity and inclusion is premised on the notion that everyone is different/unique although, as explained in Chapter Two, this difference is never actually defined. This discourse also endorses the principle of individual responsibility that underpins the discourses of both neo-liberalism and postfeminism, as I consider shortly.

Contrary to the rhetoric of the unique individual, however, I found that the discourse of diversity and inclusion articulated by companies was driven by group-based differences as evidenced by the initiatives introduced by companies, all of which were aimed at women. These included networking and training programmes, career development programmes, gender pay gap audits and numerical targets, which I discussed in an earlier section with a particular emphasis on the ways in

which they contribute to the discourse of women as having certain, undefined, essential qualities.

It is, however, clear from the literature (Dzubinski and Diehl, 2018; Gipson et al., 2017; Stoker et al., 2012) that group characteristics are also attributed to men in the sense that they are deemed to be assertive, forceful and willing to take risks. I would suggest, however, borrowing from Acker (1990), that these characteristics are understood by and within organisations as being gender neutral. Firstly, my analysis showed that men did not feature within gender diversity discourse in the sense that they were not identified as members of a specific group although obviously they were included within other categories such as disability, LGBTQ+ and so forth. Secondly, all the references to gender diversity in my sample were references to diversity for women, not men. Thirdly, if male-dominated organisations are represented as gender neutral as Acker (1990) has argued, it follows that the only person who is able to qualify for the category of the ideal worker with unique skills and talents within corporate discourse is a white, heterosexual, able-bodied man. The comparisons being made in my data were not, therefore, between groups of men and women but rather women were being measured, as a group, against the supposedly normative qualities of individual men.

On a related note, 14 of the 30 companies in my sample referred explicitly to transgender diversity, but always on pages that overwhelmingly related to LGBTQ+ groups or networks. In other words, transgender diversity was treated separately from gender diversity, reflecting the tendency of corporations to classify and categorise people into separate and specific groups. I found only two examples of organisations – Unilever and Diageo - which referred to transgender or non-binary individuals separately from the LGBTQ+ community. For instance, Unilever

launched a transgender band – called the 6 Pack Band - as part of its drive to tackle gender stereotyping in advertising, although perhaps more importantly to also increase the sale of Brooke Bond Red Label tea in India (Unilever, 2016). The Diageo example was sourced from an advertising campaign entitled "We're Open" which it launched in 2015 to sell Smirnoff to the LGBTQ+ community. This was then extended in 2017 to non-binary individuals with the tagline of "Labels are for bottles, not people" (Diageo, 2017).

It is certainly to the company's credit that the people represented in the photograph in Figure Thirteen cannot be categorised according to binary terms, indicating the possibility that it is prepared to recognise "a multiplicity of trans worlds in relation to a multiplicity of dominant ones" (Bettcher, 2014: 390).

Figure Thirteen: Diageo webpage entitled "Smirnoff continues 'We're Open' campaign with new work to raise awareness of the trans and non-binary community"

Interestingly, however, the photographs of their chairman and chief executive in Figures Fourteen and Fifteen could hardly be more different in that they are depicted as doing gender "appropriately" (Thanem and Wallenberg, 2016: 268). This disconnect between the advertisement to consumers and the representation of company personnel in its annual report neatly illustrates the gap that exists between the binary nature of corporate diversity discourse and the more fluid way in which society at large has progressed in terms of thinking about gender fluidity, as discussed in Chapter One.

Figure Fourteen: Diageo webpage entitled "Javier Ferrán, Chairman"

Figure Fifteen: Diageo annual report, 2016, page 12, image of Ivan Menezes, Chief Executive Officer

Effects of the discourses

I have argued so far in this chapter that organisations in my sample constructed three discourses of women on their diversity webpages and in their annual reports – as different, as outsiders and as deficient. Although I found that corporate diversity discourse was underpinned by certain assumptions, I also pointed out that it was simultaneously undermined by a number of contradictions. I now demonstrate how the effects of those discourses, assumptions and contradictions contribute to the overall construction of woman as "the Other" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 6) within corporate diversity discourse. By that I mean a subject who is deemed to have innate, essential qualities which are (by definition) different to those of men.

Using examples from my empirical research, I described earlier the ways in which women were grouped together such that their differences became alike. I

argued that if women's differences were alike, then women as a group must have the same characteristics as one another. This understanding simultaneously renders them different from men. It is no coincidence that this discourse that women share certain, essential qualities which makes them different from men also constitutes the cornerstone of the widely-supported business case which is predicated on the notion of "female talent" (Davies, 2015: 18) and "women's skills" (Hampton-Alexander Review, 2016: 10).

By way of reinforcing this view of women as different from men, they were also discursively constructed as outsiders in my sample of corporate diversity discourse while men were depicted as organisational insiders. A good example was provided by the pink hard hats worn only by the women. This discourse was reinforced by references to unidentified barriers which operated, at least by implication, to keep women out of the top jobs. However, I would argue that companies themselves are reinforcing these unnamed barriers by drawing on signifiers such as pink hard hats which mark women as outsiders. As such, rather than working in women's favour, the recognition of barriers feeds into Butler's (1990) point that gendered occupational segmentation is discursively constructed by the very diversity discourse that is supposed to bring it about. As such, if women cannot operate in the same way as men because of certain barriers, and if men are the ideal worker because they are unencumbered in ways that women generally are not, then women cannot ever satisfy the category of the ideal worker. In this way, the use of group categorisation and signifiers such as pink hard hats serve to mark women out as the "Other" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 6).

I also discussed how organisations grouped women together by virtue of the training, development and networking programmes and policies which they offered to

them in order (at least ostensibly) to increase the number of women in senior roles. Although the emphasis in this instance was on the shortcomings of women as a group (as opposed to the specific, female talent and skills on which the business case is predicated), it again stemmed from the notion that women have a set of innate or essential qualities. Although the dangers of stereotyping women in this way were recognised by one organisation in my sample – Unilever – it failed to make the connection that the business case is underpinned by the very same essentialist stereotypes.

These discourses were, in turn, underpinned by the assumption that diversity does not need to be defined. This, I argued, allowed organisations to stretch the definition to a point where it became meaningless, making it increasingly difficult to hold them to account for their failure to tackle gendered occupational segmentation in any meaningful way. In addition, by assuming that diversity is gender neutral organisations were able to reinforce the construction of women as deficient, a construction that was in turn supported by an emphasis on the objective nature of merit in contrast with the presumably unmeritorious discourse of diversity. In other words, if merit is objective then the reason for the lack of women in senior roles within organisations must be due to their intrinsic lack of ability. Interestingly, however, this construction of women as essentially deficient compared to men was contradicted by the underlying premise of the business case although in both instances women were constructed as having essential qualities which either rendered them perfect or imperfect, depending on the discourse.

Overall, therefore, my argument is that these discourses serve to construct a gendered, organisational subject who has certain innate, essential qualities. It is this empirical problem – that organisational diversity discourse is predicated on

essentialist discourses of women - which forms the focus of my analysis in the next chapter when I also consider why organisations might subscribe to these discourses and the implications that it has for gender equality.

Macro-discursive influences

As discussed earlier, diversity discourse at a micro level places much emphasis on the notion of the unique individual. This is no coincidence given that, as I explain in this section, it is aligned with the macro-level discourse of postfeminism whereby individual women are held to be responsible for the rational "choices" that they are deemed to have made, such as preferring to work part time and taking career breaks after having children. As such, organisations can shift responsibility for the under-representation of women in senior decision-making roles onto women themselves and away from potential structural barriers such as inflexible working hours. Despite the contradictions inherent within the discourse of the unique individual when compared with the social practice of group categorisation, they are integral to the ways in which corporate diversity discourse is mobilised within the wider discourses of neo-liberalism and postfeminism, as set out in the following section.

a) Neo-liberalism and postfeminism

As explained in Chapter Four, Foucault emphasised the importance of contextualising empirical data within its wider political context, in this case neo-liberal capitalism, in order to explain the ways in which broad societal movements affect discourses. Likewise the central focus of Adorno's work was a critical analysis of capitalism, particularly the way in which instrumental reasoning and exchange value had become the dominant considerations. As Mumby (2004: 252) says: "the roots of critical studies lie in connecting the everyday to larger political and

economic questions". This wider context is significant because as a mode of governmentality concerned with regulating "the conduct of conduct" (Rottenberg, 2014: 420), neo-liberalism is both a political discourse about the "nature of rule" (Rottenberg, 2014: 421) and a set of practices which emerged from instrumental rationality. Because neo-liberalism is said to have naturalised the free market, it has also come to be seen as normal or natural and, therefore, unchangeable (Prusik, 2017). Based on the overriding premise that competition is the only legitimate organising principle for human activity (Metcalf, 2017), the ideal society is presented as a kind of universal market and humans as little more than profit-and-loss calculators within that market (Metcalf, 2017). Indeed, one of the hallmarks of the neo-liberal age is the way it casts every human activity in entrepreneurial terms (Rottenberg, 2014), the business case being a classic example.

In terms of explaining the persistence of gendered occupational segmentation, neo-liberal argumentation has rather crudely attributed it to female "gaps" (Prügl, 2017: 43) or "deficiencies" (Crompton, 1988: 14); and/or the choices that women themselves make at an individual level, such as preferring to work part time and taking career breaks after having children (Hakim, 2000). This approach was reinforced by the companies in my sample which failed to even acknowledge the potential impact of women's caring responsibilities on the decisions that they make with regard to the workplace. According to this neo-liberal logic, any disparities that arise as a result of those decisions should act as incentives for the individuals themselves to make better choices (Hurd and Dyer, 2012; Lewis et al., 2017). It follows that if there are gender inequalities within the system, they must be the result of unequal capability or personal decision-making, as opposed to the presence of structural barriers (Lewis et al., 2017; Mendes, 2012), thereby putting

the onus on the individual to be responsible for their actions (Burton, 2014). As indicated in the section constructing women as "different", the organisations in my sample failed not only to consider what those barriers might be but also to consider the impact that caring responsibilities might have on their capacity to become the "ideal worker" (Benschop and Van den Brink, 2018: 2; Cha, 2013: 161). This discourse was reinforced by the training and development programmes that organisations offered ostensibly to help women get to the top, as well as the numerical targets introduced by 12 of the 30 organisations in the sample.

This discourse of a unique individual who makes decisions unaffected by wider social practices also serves to conceal a range of gendered (and taken for granted) assumptions that lie buried within corporate diversity discourse. In particular, it conflates the natural with the cultural, thereby equating the bodies of women with their sexed and gendered characteristics such that they are reduced to the status of objects, a point I consider in more detail in the next chapter. As such, the discourse of neo-liberalism can help to explain the emergence of postfeminism which emphasises a "grammar of individualism" (Gill, 2007: 153), presenting women as independent agents no longer held back by inequalities or power imbalances (Duffy et al., 2016). As autonomous individuals, they are required to bring about their own transformation into good neo-liberal subjects through a process of self-surveillance and self-discipline (Adamson, 2017), presumably to better understand their own shortcomings. As already pointed out, however, it is women, rather than men, who are endlessly required to undergo these "technologies of the self" (Foucault, 1988: 18) or "makeover" processes (Gill, 2007: 156) as the subjects of coaching or self-development programmes offered to them by their employers. This process was also presented as one that they had freely chosen, an emphasis that

neatly obscures the gendered nature of various organisational assumptions (Marshall, 1993a), such as the need for "unencumbered worker[s]" (Lewis et al., 2017: 219), as discussed in an earlier section.

The notion of free choice within neo-liberal capitalism (and its postfeminist subject) can also be analysed as a form of subject-centred reasoning, given that it is based on the premise that subjects can (and should) make their own choices and come to their own decisions. Far from offering subjects a free choice, however, the business case serves not just to conceal the power relations underpinning diversity but also marks a break from equal opportunities which was overtly aimed at countering the historical social wrongs suffered by women. It is this history that critical discourse analysis strives to uncover by looking at how certain moral practices develop and become institutionalised to the point whereby they are taken for granted (Saar, 2008). This genealogical approach requires researchers to identify the discontinuity of historical objects over time while tracing the emergence of new objects or practices (Saar, 2008) as I now consider.

b) From social justice to instrumental reason

As discussed in Chapter Two, organisations started to move away from equal opportunities towards a discourse of diversity management and the business case for diversity in the 1980s, marking a shift from the ethos of social justice that underpinned equal opportunities towards the instrumental rationality underpinning the business case. That is not to say that the history of the division of labour up until the era of equal opportunities had been one of endless progress, but rather that history is neither continuous nor discontinuous, but is "continuous in [its] discontinuity" (Adorno, 2006a: 92). In other words, Adorno did not believe that history should be viewed as a continuum based on a belief that "things are getting

better all the time" (Adorno, 2006a: 92). Foucault likewise was sceptical about the concept of a continuous history (Foucault, 1972). By applying this understanding to occupational segmentation, the possibility emerges that it did not evolve as a single, continuous story but rather as a series of concepts that have ebbed and flowed over time, explaining why different occupations have been deemed suitable for women at different historical periods. Not only have these changed depending on the era and the assumed capabilities of women, but they have also differed according to the prevailing class system and the particular culture of the country in which women lived and worked. For instance, although an egalitarian system generally prevailed in pre-history and carried over into the earliest agrovillages (Boulding, 1976), by the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the UK, middle and upper-class women were not allowed to work either inside or outside the home. Working class women, on the other hand, were subjected to both a public and a private patriarchy (Walby, 1990) in that they had to work both outside (often in factories for long hours) and inside the home.

This concept of a discontinuous history can also help to explain the shift in approaches adopted by corporations in relation to sex discrimination over time in the UK. As explained in Chapter Two, it was not really tackled until the era of equal opportunities was ushered in during the 1970s, following an influx of women into the labour market and the introduction of anti-discrimination and equal pay legislation. The discourse of equal opportunities was, however, replaced in the following decade by the discourse of diversity management and the business case for diversity, a change mirrored by many of the organisations in my data sample. After a period of relative historical progress in terms of the introduction of equality legislation, this

shift was not a progressive one for women, not least because it helped to legitimise the repression of social egalitarianism (Burton, 2014).

Indeed, I would say that it represented a step backwards in the struggle for women's equality, for two main reasons. Firstly, the diversity discourse is premised on the neo-liberal notion of the unique individual who is responsible for themselves, as indicated above; whilst equal opportunities was based on the notion that everyone should be treated the same so that they have the same opportunity to progress. Secondly, the diversity discourse, particularly the business case for diversity, is based on the concept of instrumental rationality or exchange value, whilst equal opportunities were rooted in social justice (Brewis, 2017). That is not to say that equal opportunities are unproblematic as a concept. Indeed, although anti-discrimination legislation in the UK is supposedly premised on the principle of equality of opportunity (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2019), it also prohibits employers from pursuing proactive policies such as quotas and targets, subtly reinforcing certain neoliberal tenets such as individual moral responsibility and merit (Burton, 2014).

Although this shift in approach from equal opportunities to diversity in the industrialised west has been widely documented by diversity scholars (Cukier et al., 2017; Lorbiecki and Jack, 2000; Ozbilgin and Tatli, 2011; Tomlinson and Schwabenland, 2009; Zanoni et al., 2010), 18 of the companies in my sample made no distinction in their annual reports and on their websites between the two concepts to the extent that they used the terms inter-changeably. For instance, GKN stated that they "value diversity and promote equal opportunities for all employees …" (GKN plc, Undated: 15); while Glencore said that they "value diversity …, providing equal opportunities throughout the organisation" (Glencore plc, 2016: 29). For their

part, Mediclinic stated that they ""value diversity and provide equal opportunities for all in the workplace" (Mediclinic International plc, 2016: 8). In other words, rather than viewing the two concepts as antithetical to one another in the sense that one is about sameness while the other reflects difference, these companies have conflated them. My findings therefore diverge from those of Tatli (2011) and Zanoni and Janssens (2004) whose interviewees insisted that there had been a wholesale shift from equal opportunities to that of diversity, whereas companies in my sample made no attempt to separate the two. This development may or may not be accidental but I would suggest that, by conflating the two, it has allowed organisations to continue to pay lip service to the concept of equal opportunities whilst adhering to the instrumental language of diversity.

Conclusion

Having identified five broad thematic areas mobilised by the companies in my sample in relation to diversity, I drew on Foucault's definition of discourse as "practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak" (Foucault, 1972: 49) as the basis for my analytical framework, with a particular emphasis on the concepts of power and subjectivity. In order to "translate" (Ahl, 2007: 224) these Foucauldian concepts and principles into my study, I closely studied the text and images in my sample in order to identify diversity discourses about women.

Although I identified three discourses framing women as different, as outsiders and as deficient, other researchers might well have found others. Not only did these discourses implicitly position women as inferior or secondary to men, they also reinforced the view that men hold power because that is deemed to be the natural order of things. In other words, men hold the majority of high-level executive posts because they are forceful, assertive and decisive; while women are under-

represented in the top jobs because they are kind, communal, sympathetic and concerned about others, qualities associated with child-rearing and the home (Gipson et al., 2017; Heilman, 2001; Stoker et al., 2012). Underpinning these constructions of women, I found two basic assumptions of diversity discourse – the first being that there is no need to define diversity and/or inclusion, the second being that it is gender neutral.

Although I found an overwhelming consensus among the companies in my sample that diversity in general and the business case in particular is "a good thing" if only because of its potential to improve organisational performance, I also found it was layered with contradictions. Firstly it threw doubt on the purpose and value of merit; secondly, it depicted women as perfect subjects who hold it in their power to improve organisational performance whilst simultaneously portraying them as imperfect subjects who need help to get to the top; and thirdly it categorised women as a group alongside a discourse of the unique individual. These contradictions emerged partly from the tendency of companies to conflate diversity with the discourse of equal opportunities, but also because of the tendency to interpret gender diversity as a synonym for equality for women. In addition, by insisting that merit, as an objective standard, is the basis for appointing applicants, companies reinforced the view that diverse candidates cannot be the best candidates. By applying a genealogical lens to these contradictory discourses, however, I was able to uncover some of the "buried, subjugated knowledges" (Foucault, 1980: 83) that lay within them, including the contradictory subject positions of women.

In line with their failure to define diversity and/or merit, none of the companies in my sample said what success would look like. Although some might point to the increase in the numbers of women board members over the last few years as an

indicator, it is impossible to know whether the increase has been the result of introducing a "regime of practices" (Foucault, 1991b: 75) or other factors such as government pressure (Davies, 2011; Davies, 2015; Hampton-Alexander Review, 2016). For instance, the 2011 Davies review made clear that if businesses did not achieve "significant change" (Davies, 2011: 2), the government would reserve the right to introduce quotas for women on boards. It is perhaps not surprising, therefore, that although companies appear committed to mobilising a discourse of diversity and inclusion, backed up by processes and programmes, they seem to be less enthused when it comes to ascertaining their efficacy. However, by pointing to what they say as well as what they do, companies have been able to perpetuate the idea that the problem lies with women themselves, an approach that has been reinforced in a wider social context by a system of neo-liberalism and the emergence of postfeminism, both of which emphasise the centrality of the responsibility of the individual in making their own way to the top. Finally, I traced the shift from equal opportunities, which was based on social justice, to the instrumental nature of diversity discourse in the context of a discontinuous history, thereby connecting diversity management practices to different levels of discourse.

In order to theoretically analyse my main finding from this chapter – that women are discursively constructed as subjects with certain innate, essential qualities within corporate diversity discourse - I draw in the next chapter on a number of different concepts mobilised by Adorno. These include the concepts of the remainder, classification and categorisation, exchange value, instrumental reason, and Adorno's inquiry into natural history. By drawing on these concepts, I focus on the ways in which essentialism constitutes a form of identity thinking which stems from the notion that we can know an object once all possible classifications of

it have been made. In that vein, I point out that corporations have fallen into the trap of equating the bodies of women with their sexed and gendered characteristics, reducing them to little more than objects. In other words, whatever the discursive rhetoric of the unique individual, organisational diversity discourse is a classic example of identity thinking as I now go on to explain.

Chapter Six

Classification, categorisation and their consequences

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I presented my findings from the critical discourse analysis that I carried out of the text and images relating to gender diversity gathered from the websites of 30 FTSE 100 companies. By applying a Foucauldian lens to the discourses that I identified, I was able to uncover certain "buried, subjugated knowledges" (Foucault, 1980: 83) in relation to both the formation of the subject and the ways in which power relations operated to sustain the status quo through a "regime of practices" (Foucault, 1991b: 75).

In particular, the last chapter reflected the different ways in which I found that women were discursively constructed within organisational gender diversity discourse. That is, as different, as organisational outsiders and as deficient, reducing them to subjects who have certain innate, essential qualities. I then considered some of the assumptions underpinning these discourses by assessing the significance of diversity as an empty signifier to the extent that corporations can interpret it to be whatever they want it to be, a point I consider further in this chapter. In addition, although there was an assumption among the companies in my sample that diversity was gender neutral, I found that it was generally being used as a synonym for gender diversity which was equated with women's equality. These discourses, in turn, generated a number of contradictions, including the ways in which merit was pitched as being in conflict with diversity, indicating that diverse candidates are not necessarily viewed in the same way as meritorious candidates. I then considered the contradictory ways in which women were simultaneously

portrayed as perfect and imperfect subjects. Finally, I explored the ways in which companies referred to the unique individual at the heart of diversity discourse, whilst simultaneously categorising them under group headings before considering some of the macro-discursive influences highlighting the ways in which women were marginalised and/or excluded within diversity discourse.

I now go on to analyse my main empirical finding - that women are discursively constructed as subjects with innate, essentialist qualities - from the perspective of Adorno's critique of identity thinking, with a specific focus on the concepts identified in Chapter Three. These include the concept of the remainder, Adorno's inquiry into natural history, instrumental reason and exchange value. The main method of analysis is one of immanent critique which centres on the need to problematise the object and its relationship with the subject, including an exploration of the ways in which the male subject is prioritised within corporate diversity discourse. This approach underpins Adorno's emphasis on the priority of the object which allows for the possibility that it is more than it appears to be. As this notion of the remainder is central to his theory of negative dialectics, I start the chapter with a brief overview of how other researchers have drawn on ideas of negative ontology as a way of tracing the construction of social reality by means of conceptualising lack. This, in turn, facilitates a discussion of the ways in which discourse is constructed to cover over contradictions with particular reference to my transgender data.

The Real, the remainder and negative ontologies

As mentioned in the last chapter, none of the companies in my sample explained what they meant by diversity. Instead they referred to it in its "widest" or "broadest" sense, a finding endorsed by other critical diversity scholars (Brewis,

2019; Christensen and Muhr, 2018; Heres and Benschop, 2010; Stockdale et al., 2018). Drawing on Lacanian psychoanalysis, Christensen and Muhr (2018: 115) explain that this is because it is impossible to define a concept that is "characterised by emptiness, a constitutive lack that leaves it for others to assign meaning and value to it in order to give it form". As such, they conceptualise diversity in terms of a negative ontology which contains at its heart an emptiness or absence. Nevertheless, diversity managers continue to conceptualise and imagine diversity as though it were meaningful (Christensen and Muhr, 2018). As Kelly (2014) points out in his negative ontological study of leadership, this is because empty signifiers can contain and express any number of possible definitions, but without providing any insight into their essence. In that sense, diversity is not manageable because of the different paradoxes produced by this lack or absence of meaning (Kelly, 2014). As a result of this desire to give meaning to a concept that cannot contain meaning, however, organisational subjects experience a "lack", which is the void in the concept of diversity itself (Christensen and Muhr, 2018).

Contu and Willmott (2006) also draw on this concept of a negative ontology in their study of the work practices of technicians and the ways in which they reproduce capitalist work relations. Again drawing on Lacan, they are interested in the ways that social reality is discursively constructed in language by means of conceptualising lack in the sense that discourses are never complete because they "are always failed/impossible" (Contu and Willmott, 2006: 1772). This impossibility, which is called the Real in Lacanian terms, cannot be understood as social reality or indeed as something that has a positive presence in empirical material. Instead it has to be regarded as the lack of something (Hoedemaekers, 2010). In other words, something that can never be truly understood or explained (Christensen and Muhr,

2018). Conversely, it is precisely because discourses are never complete that the notion of failure or impossibility can also be understood as an excess, a surplus of meaning, a "left-over in the symbolic (discourse)" (Contu and Willmott, 2006: 1772). As such, the Real can be conceptualised as the remainder in signifiers. Since there is a hole in the signifier, it cannot fully determine the subject (Leeb, 2008). Despite his interest in the Real within language, Lacan's analysis resembles in large part the notion of the remainder in concepts within Adorno's theory of negative dialectics which is predicated on the notion that each object is unique. As such, there is always something that remains, something that is left over after the object has gone into its concept. It is this thing that remains that constitutes its non-identical aspect. Given the essentialist nature of corporate diversity discourse, however, this lack/excess or remainder is, paradoxically, denied to those to whom the discourse applies.

For instance, as discussed in Chapter One, the notion of gender fluidity has become increasingly visible within the media, popular culture and equality law as well as academia, in stark contrast to the approach of corporate diversity discourse which continues to categorise and classify people into different, specific groups. In my study of online gender diversity discourse, I was very struck by its binary nature and its emphasis on women as a homogenous group who are said to manifest innate, essential qualities such as "female talent" (Davies, 2015: 18) and "women's skills" (Hampton-Alexander Review, 2016: 10). As a result, organisations seemed to desire homogeneity rather than difference in the sense that all women are deemed, as part of a group, to be alike as discussed in the previous chapter.

Likewise, as discussed in the previous chapter, transgender diversity was generally classified within the category of LGBTQ+, despite the diversity of a

community which includes the genderqueer, male to female transsexuals, female to male transsexuals, drag queens and kings as well as cross-dressers and "everyone else in-between the sex binary" (Gherovici, 2017: 3). Indeed, as discussed in Chapter One, some members of the trans community are in favour of challenging the criteria that are used to determine gender in order to undo or redo what is meant by it. Conversely, corporations are engaged in setting distinct parameters, presumably as a way of exercising power, in order to contain and control these different groups so that they are rendered alike rather than different. As a result, there is a lack of acknowledgement within diversity discourse of the negative ontological premise on which the notion of transgender or non-binary rests. The end result is that the transgender community is subjected to a process of categorisation within corporate diversity discourse. However, as mentioned earlier, the advantage for organisations is that, as an empty signifier, "gender diversity" and/or "LGBTQ+" can refer to any number of subjects, objects, discourses and so on without actually providing any real insight into what they might mean, thereby covering over contradictions and impossibility that is inherent within the discourse.

Although the Lacanian interpretation reveals the negative ontology at the heart of diversity discourse, it is also open to some of the criticisms that have been levelled at the poststructuralist project discussed in Chapters Two and Three. In particular, as indicated in Chapter Three, it is open to the criticism that it undermines the notion of the whole subject (Leeb, 2008). Adorno, on the other hand, did not want to sever signifiers, meanings and referents, but rather he wanted to analyse the subject-object relation in order to emphasise contradictions. In other words, he stressed the need to reveal dialectics as the radical consciousness of non-identity, whilst accepting that consciousness has to be expressed through language

(Hohendahl, 1997). In this way, language can, through negativity, articulate difference, releasing the subject-object relation from its fixed and undialectical position (Hohendahl, 1997). I now go on to explore this subject-object relationship through the lens of Adorno's negative dialectics in order to theorise the so-called unique individual within corporate diversity discourse.

Groups, individuals and the remainder

As indicated above, the failure to define diversity has facilitated a contradictory narrative of a "unique" individual who is simultaneously valued for the skills and talents denoted by their essentialist, group membership (Ozbilgin and Tatli, 2011; Tatli, 2011; Zanoni and Janssens, 2004). As such, whatever the rhetoric about the unique individual within corporate diversity discourse, the data in my sample showed that companies overwhelmingly continued to endorse the concept of the group categorisation of women. Whilst acknowledging that critical diversity scholars have also analysed the tension between the discursive concept of individual difference mobilised by companies and the practice of group-based categorisation (Ozbilgin and Tatli, 2011; Johns and Green, 2009), I suggest that corporate diversity discourse can also be understood by immanently analysing women in terms of their status as objects (rather than subjects). As indicated in Chapter Three, Adorno (1973: 149) argued that instead of identity thinking, the "secret telos" of thinking should be dialectical or non-identity thinking. By pointing to the non-identity of the concept with the object, he argued that parts of the object are revealed that were previously hidden (Molt, 2002). It is in this way that we can see that "objects do not go into their concepts without leaving a remainder" (Adorno, 1973: 5). However, within the subject-centred reasoning of the business case, the unique characteristics of women have become buried, with the result that they are

not perceived as individuals, but rather as a group with the essential characteristics attributed to that group in the guise of either perfect or imperfect subjects, as discussed in Chapter Five.

Although it is clear from the literature (Gipson et al., 2017; Heilman, 2001; Stoker et al., 2012) that group characteristics are also attributed to men in the sense that they are deemed to be assertive, decisive etc, I would suggest, borrowing from Acker (1990), that these characteristics are viewed within organisations as gender neutral, as opposed to being essentialist. Indeed, as explained in Chapter Five, my data showed that men were not identified as a group in need of protection. By contrast, all the references to gender diversity in my sample were references to diversity for women, not men. Given that organisations are represented as gender neutral within corporate discourse, the unique individual with unique skills and talents at its heart must be a man. Women, on the other hand, can only bring "female talent" (Davies, 2015: 18) and "women's skills" (Hampton-Alexander Review, 2016: 10) to the table by virtue of being part of womanhood reinforcing the point that woman is the "Other" (de Beauvoir, 2011: 44) within the business case. This recognition of a distinction between the unique qualities of men and the group qualities of women is particularly significant in that the tendency to bury the specific under the general is one of the hallmarks of identity thinking.

In many ways it would be easy to dismiss this tension between the individual and the group as simply a feature of corporate life whereby organisations seek to promote a particular public face, albeit one that is at odds with the practices in which they engage. That might well be true but my Adorno-based critique suggests that there is something more important to be noted than a straightforward public/private dichotomy. That is because, by virtue of categorising objects (in this case, the

bodies of women) under general concepts, identity thinking buries the particular

qualities of those objects under their universal concept. My analysis suggests that,

as identity thinking is inevitable in the absence of critical reflexivity, corporations are

almost bound to label different groups of people into a series of diversity categories,

thereby universalising them (as opposed to focusing on their particular qualities), as

I found in my research.

Apart from the rhetorical gap that is thereby exposed within corporate diversity

discourse, there is a further contradiction in the sense that the unique individual

embraced by that discourse is also embraced by Adorno, but with a difference.

Importantly, he advocates that the particular qualities of subjects have to be brought

out from under the shadow of the universal. Identity thinking, on the other hand,

buries the particular under the universal. So although corporate diversity discourse

refers repeatedly to the unique individual, it cannot access that individual because it

is dominated by identity thinking. A good example of this, as made clear in Chapter

Five, is the way that women's essential characteristics are universalised within

corporate diversity discourse such that they are portrayed, as objects, to be the sum

total of those characteristics. As such, there is a "particular" object advocated by

Adorno within non-identity thinking and a "unique" object mobilised by corporate

identity thinking. These are very different concepts, despite the overlapping

terminology. Clearly it is easy to criticise and I accept that it may be difficult for

organisations to avoid this conundrum. However, unless and until they are able to

be more reflexive about some of the problems generated by the rhetorical gap

between what they say and the practices in which they engage it is hard to see how

current diversity discourse can lead to greater gender equality. Likewise, it is hard to

see how the practice of privileging men as subjects can result in greater equality for women, as considered in the following section.

Privileging the male subject

As identity thinking makes the mistake of assuming that the subject can know an object once all possible classifications of it have been made, it equates essence with appearance in which "the subject ultimately finds itself confirmed" (Adorno, 1973: 167). The need to distinguish between subject and object is therefore fundamental to Adorno's critique of identity thinking which, he argued, originated as a way of dominating nature and therefore woman (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2002), as discussed in Chapter Three. He does not argue that it is an intrinsically irrational process; rather, the problem (as already mentioned) is the type of subjectivistic thinking that it produces stemming from the tendency within identity thinking to classify and categorise. As Adorno and Horkheimer point out, however, classification is no more than a "condition of knowledge, not knowledge itself; and knowledge in turn dissolves the classification" (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2002: 182).

Adorno's emphasis on the priority of the object therefore reinforces the argument in the previous section that, as it is only men who have unique qualities (while women have essential group qualities), women cannot enjoy subjectivity and agency, as other diversity scholars have noted (Holck et al., 2016; Zanoni and Janssens, 2004). As discussed in the previous chapter, diversity was interpreted by some of the companies in my sample to mean gender diversity which, in turn, applied only to women, rendering woman as the object of diversity who must be controlled. As a result, managers (who are mainly men) must be the privileged subject within the diversity discourse. Clearly, I am not the first critical diversity researcher to analyse gender diversity discourse in terms of the privileged subject

position of men. However, not only does my application of Adorno's critique of subjectivistic identity thinking reinforce the conclusions of critical diversity scholars, it offers the added understanding that, by virtue of privileging men with the status of subjects, women are fashioned into the object of diversity by being categorised as members of a group, with the essential characteristics attributed to that group.

The problems that women face within this type of thinking are, I would suggest, three-fold. Firstly, because identity thinking equates essence with appearance, it is assumed that women constitute the sum total of their group characteristics, with the result that there is no remainder, the hallmark of identity thinking. As such, women are stereotyped as constituting the characteristics attributed to them within the business case for diversity in terms of their "female talent" (Davies, 2015: 18) and "women's skills" (Hampton-Alexander Review, 2016: 10). Secondly, because of their identification with nature, they are denied the status of a subject, as both Adorno and de Beauvoir have repeatedly pointed out (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2002; de Beauvoir, 2011), thereby reinforcing their position as an object within the diversity discourse. Thirdly, they are perceived as a tangible object to be managed and controlled (Holck et al., 2016; Ahonen et al.) by means of the group-based policies that organisations have introduced such as networking and career development programmes.

Subjectivity and objectivity

So far in this chapter I have focused on some of the ways in which Adorno's critique of identity thinking can help to provide a theoretical focus for analysing corporate diversity discourse. In particular, I emphasised the importance of the remainder to this process, thereby reflecting Adorno's insistence on the priority of the object whilst not overlooking the need to retain the subject. In the last chapter,

on the other hand, I emphasised the ways in which women were portrayed as both perfect and imperfect subjects within diversity discourse. I now evaluate these representations of women as subjects and objects in light of the difference in meanings between these terms within identity and non-identity thinking and the implications of those different meanings for a critical analysis of corporate diversity discourse.

As set out in Chapter Four, subjectivity, according to Foucault, refers to an individual who is "subject to" someone else through the power and control that that person has over them (Foucault, 1982: 781). As part of that process, they become objectified (Foucault, 1994). For Adorno a subject is a reference to a particular individual or to consciousness in general (Adorno, 1998); while the object is "something other than" the subject within non-identity thinking (Adorno, 1973: 183), meaning that there is a difference or a remainder that is always left over between the subject and the object. As such, all subjects are objects but not all objects are subjects with the result that being an object forms part of the meaning of subjectivity whereas it is not necessarily part of the meaning of objectivity to be a subject (Adorno, 1973). In order to avoid getting trapped in a subject/object binary of his own making, however, Adorno argues that an object can only be known "as it entwines with subjectivity" (Adorno, 1973: 186) such that the two are mutually mediated (Adorno, 1998).

These philosophical considerations segue into a specific issue facing women within corporations and that is the contradiction within diversity discourse between the Foucauldian subjectification of women as a perfect but simultaneously imperfect subject which I identified in the course of my critical discourse analysis. On the one hand, women were subjectified in terms of having certain essential female

characteristics which were never specified, but which were deemed to be necessary for corporations to succeed in terms of improving performance and profitability. On the other hand, they were seen as lacking in certain essential male qualities such as confidence and ambition such that they needed support to get to the top through networking, training and career development programmes. Apart from being yet another example of binary thinking in terms of comparing women's deficiencies with men's abilities, the link between being valued by one's employer or being denigrated by them can be traced to the reification of gender roles that is said to attach to each of these object formations. By applying the lens of identity thinking, these formulations can be analysed as reinforcing gendered occupational segmentation precisely because they stem from a process of classification and categorisation.

In an earlier section of this chapter I explained that, as a result of being objectified within identity thinking, women can only amount to the sum total of their sexed and gendered characteristics. In other words, they are assumed to amount to no more than their body. As Butler (1990a, 1993) points out, this is because the body of woman is automatically sexed and gendered from birth (or sometimes before). Non-identity thinking, on the other hand, offers a different perspective in that it tells us that the object of woman's body must amount to more than her sexed and gendered characteristics because there is always a remainder. This non-identitarian approach therefore opens up the possibility for feminists to argue that the object of woman's body can be distinguished from the sexed and gendered characteristics imposed on that body, thereby acknowledging that although women have bodies they always add up to more than the concepts that are socially imposed on them. It is from this gap between subject and object that woman's particular, unknown qualities can emerge. It is possible to reach this theoretical understanding without

falling into a mind/body dualism on two grounds. The first is because of the ways in which objectivity and subjectivity are separate yet intertwined in Adorno's theory; and the second is because non-identity thinking allows for a remainder such that the object always amounts to more than the subject.

Sex, gender, natural history and the remainder

In addition to conflating gender diversity with women (as explained in Chapter Five), almost a third of the companies in my sample conflated the terms sex and gender. In particular, a fifth seemed unclear as to whether gender or sex was the protected characteristic under UK law. For instance Babcock International and Next referred to gender, Mediclinic to sex while 3i Group, Coca-Cola and Whitbread referred to both sex and gender, despite the fact that sex is the protected characteristic, not gender, under section 11 of the Equality Act (Legislation.gov.uk, 2010). As such, the explanatory note to the section provides that the reference to the protected characteristic of sex in section 11 means "being a man or a woman, and that men share this characteristic with other men, and women with other women" (Legislation.gov.uk, 2010). Section 212(1) of the Act defines a man as a "male of any age" and a woman as a "female of any age" (Legislation.gov.uk, 2010). In other words, the law defines sex in terms of physiological attributes while gender is not defined at all (Murray and Hunter Blackburn, 2019).

Although Foucault has been criticised for observing a curious gender "neutrality" (King, 2004: 29), he can still be said to have contributed to an analysis of sex as "law and taboo" (Foucault, 1978: 155), a point that Butler subsequently developed through the concept of "normativity" in which she argued that the category of sex was a "regulatory ideal" or practice that produced the bodies it

governs (Butler, 1993: 1). I consider this point further in this section by drawing on

Adorno's concept of natural history to support the argument that, by virtue of

conflating history, nature and myth, organisations have discursively conflated the

concepts of sex and gender within the business case such that they constitute the

entirety of the object of woman, with nothing left over.

To briefly recap, this was an inquiry into the history of nature but one which

did not have at its heart an historical component. Instead, by developing the "idea of

natural-history" (Adorno, 2006b: 253) Adorno's aim was to account for and

understand historical change by viewing an object as natural where it appeared

most historical; and as historical where it appeared most natural (Hullot-Kentor,

2006). Adorno identified two parts to nature - first nature which represents physical

or biological nature and second nature which represents myth or culture. He argued

that because we have forgotten that the social world is artificially devised, it appears

to us that it cannot be changed (Cook, 2016). As a result, we live in an "inverted

world" where nature has been socialised and the sociohistorical world has been

naturalised to become a form of second nature (Cook, 2016: 726). Adorno identifies

not just the dialectical relationship between these two parts (the object of biology

and the concept of culture) but emphasises that they should also leave a

"remainder" (Adorno, 1973: 5). As explained above, this is the difference that is

always left over between the subject and the object within non-identity thinking,

thereby allowing the moment of non-identity to emerge. However, because of the

identitarian thinking that pervades organisational diversity discourse, objects are

assumed to be equal to their concepts. In this way, the concepts of sex and gender

become reified as though they constitute the body itself, with nothing left over. By

focusing on the "remainder" within non-identity thinking (Adorno, 1973: 5), on the

other hand, Adorno offers the possibility to think differently by analysing the relationship between the concepts of sex and gender in the context of the object of the body rather than the concepts themselves and their relationship to each other, potentially allowing a contradictory social reality to be revealed (Dineen, 2011).

As indicated previously, the discourse of the business case for diversity put forward by so many of the organisations in my sample is predicated on a neo-liberal, capitalist logic. As such, it is presented as one of pure reason or enlightenment. So for instance, Royal Mail says that "[a]ny business that doesn't recognise women's role in making it successful will, inevitably, fail" (Springboard Consultancy, Undated). In other words, it assumes there is an inherent, logical, reasoned link between the involvement of women in an organisation and its success. However, this link stems from viewing women solely as "an example of the species, a representative of her sex, and thus, wholly encompassed by male logic, she stands for nature" (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2002: 87). In other words, it stems from seeing woman as the embodiment of nature itself.

Nevertheless, it makes sense, according to this "male logic" (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2002: 87), to employ women because they are perceived to have different essential qualities compared to men, stemming primarily from their association with nature, and which are, in turn linked with certain predetermined patterns of behaviour. It is therefore this "female talent" (Davies, 2015: 18) and these "women's skills" (Hampton-Alexander Review, 2016: 10) which, when harnessed, that are said to lead to greater profitability and/or performance. This discriminatory perception of women is, of course, as old as the labour market itself as made clear in Chapter One. The difference now, however, is that it comes dressed in diversity clothing. As the concepts of sex and gender have the status of a law of second nature (or

myth/culture), the logic of the diversity discourse is also perceived as natural. Given that the object of woman is perceived by organisations as being equal to the concepts of sex and gender, she, in turn, is perceived as being natural, with no remainder. In other words, she is viewed not only as being dominated by the laws of nature (and therefore denied subjectivity) but her essential/ natural characteristics are perceived as being innate and unchangeable throughout history.

Adorno, on the other hand, made clear that, far from leading from "savagery to humanitarianism" there is no such thing as a universal history but rather one that is made up of "discontinuous, chaotically splintered moments and phases" (Adorno, 1973: 320). Likewise, Foucault's aim in adopting genealogy as a tool was to emancipate "historical knowledges" from the coercion of a "scientific discourse" (Foucault, 1980: 85) and to reveal "buried, subjugated knowledges" (Foucault, 1980: 83) by highlighting changes over time in their meaning and purpose. Contrary to the precepts underpinning the diversity discourse, therefore, the gendered concepts of "female talent" (Davies, 2015: 18) and "women's skills" (Hampton-Alexander Review, 2016: 10) are mutable and have indeed changed over time, as explained in Chapter One. Moreover, it is inevitable that they will continue to change – the question is in what ways and how quickly. Given the dominance of neo-liberal thinking and its emphasis on instrumental reasoning, as outlined in Chapter Five, the omens are not favourable.

Equal opportunities, diversity and instrumental reason

Although 18 of the companies in my data conflated the terms equal opportunities and diversity in their policy documents, the dominant discursive terms on their webpages and in their annual reports were overwhelmingly those of diversity and inclusion as pointed out in Chapter Five. I acknowledge that this

process of "switching" (Ahmed, 2007: 242) between equal opportunities and diversity has been widely documented by other scholars (Lorbiecki and Jack, 2000; Ozbilgin and Tatli, 2011; Tomlinson and Schwabenland, 2009; Zanoni et al., 2010) and is not therefore a new finding, but would put forward the view that it can be interpreted differently by drawing on Adorno's critique of identity thinking as I now explain.

Identity thinking includes a number of different elements that are all linked, including instrumental reasoning, subject-centred thinking and a tendency to classify and categorise. Although equal opportunities can be criticised for its emphasis on group membership (and therefore a tendency towards classification), its ethos of social justice ensured, at the very least, that the historical dynamics of gender discrimination were not overlooked, nor the disadvantages that resulted from the operation of those dynamics for women at work (Ozbilgin and Tatli, 2011). The business case, on the other hand, is dominated by identity thinking in that it combines an emphasis on essentialist group membership (despite proclaiming a concern for the unique individual) with instrumental reasoning. By switching from one term to the other within their policies, companies have buried the ideal of social justice whilst at the same time rendering non-identical individuals commensurable (Adorno, 1973). In other words, despite the continued discursive use of equal opportunities by companies in my sample, they have instrumentalised the concept by abandoning the ethos of social justice, replacing it instead with the identarian discourse of exchange value. In this way the subject-centred reasoning that now dominates corporate discourse has replaced what was originally an equalities agenda based explicitly on social justice and righting historical wrongs, turning women into objects of equivalence rather than potential subjects of liberation.

The point to make here is not that instrumental reasoning is without value (indeed, Adorno and Horkheimer acknowledge this in *Dialectic of Enlightenment*) but rather that it has come to dominate all reasoning in our subject-centred world, such that this attentiveness to means threatens to become an end in itself (Alvesson, 1996). When unchecked by critical reason, therefore, there is a strong risk that this approach of instrumental rationality produces a "means-ends dystopia" where, over time, the value of ends is assessed solely in terms of what is achievable within the available means such that no other dialogue is possible (Alvesson, 1996: 97). The result is a world in which we value an increase in the numbers of women in the interests of money and power as opposed to the opportunity to bring about a better (more equal) world, as discussed in Chapter Five.

Exchange value, merit and the business case

This mechanistic thinking is so prevalent within the business case that, as Murray (2014: 523) points out, it requires women to offer something different/extra to companies in the form of "added value". Indeed, Whitbread specifically referred to the "added value" which "differences can bring" (Whitbread plc, 2013: 1). However, the added value within the business case is predicated on the notion that women have certain essential skills and talents that companies now recognise as being of benefit to them. As such, women are required by this essentialist discourse to demonstrate that they can add value to the firm's bottom line, rendering them little more than an organisational monetisation tool.

Whilst not disagreeing with Murray's (2014: 523) analysis of "added value", I think that the implications of this discourse can be better understood through the lens of exchange value. Originally a Marxist concept, Adorno (1973: 146) drew on it to argue that through exchange value "non-identical individuals and performances

become commensurable and identical", a process that is achieved within bourgeois society by reducing dissimilar things to "abstract quantities" (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2002: 4). As this principle spreads, so too does the obligation on the whole world to become "identical, to become total" (Adorno, 1973: 146) so much so that it now seems that the only reason to increase the number of women on boards is to improve a firm's profit margins as part of a rational cost-benefit analysis (Dye and Golnaraghi, 2015; Noon, 2007; Urwin et al., 2013). In other words, women are valued for their supposed essentialist group qualities as women but not for the unique skills and talents that individual women presumably possess.

As indicated earlier, this assumption is taken for granted to such an extent that it has become a "no brainer" (Changing People, 2015), underlining Adorno's warning that barter (or exchange) automatically creates a false consciousness which prevents individuals from seeing the homogeneity imposed on them by reification (Adorno, 1973). Indeed, as pointed out in the last chapter, 19 of the companies in my sample explicitly made clear their support for the business case, despite providing no evidence to substantiate the claim that having more women on their boards would result in improved organisational performance. Nor did any of them identify the qualities that women supposedly bring to the board. It follows that as the business case for diversity is predicated on essentialist stereotypes, it is unlikely to lead to emancipation for women apart from a superficial equality that amounts to little more than the "tit for tat" of exchange (Adorno, 2006a: 170).

Likewise, by drawing on Adorno's concept of exchange value, it is also possible to analyse merit as an "exchange of equivalents" (Cook, 2010: 122) in that it represents "an exchange of things that are equal and yet unequal" (Adorno, 1973: 147). In other words, although the concept of merit is presented as an exchange of

objectively measured skills and talents for, say, a place on a corporate board, Adorno's immanent critique shows that it serves to conceal the power that is embedded within particular types of institutions and norms, reinforced by the social practices adopted by those institutions, as discussed in Chapter Five. As the concept of merit is based on criteria set and operationalised by those in positions of authority, in practice key competence becomes male competence, emphasising essential qualities associated with men and masculinities, such as being aggressive, forceful and decisive (Gipson et al., 2017; Stoker et al., 2012). Using these measures, women can be constructed as inferior to men, as discussed in more detail in Chapter Five, on the basis that their competence can be said to have been evaluated in ostensibly gender-neutral ways (Pesonen et al., 2009), but has fallen short of the required standard. Conversely, a lack of merit is not simply a matter of unequal power relations that result in oppression. Instead it is a form of suffering which stems from the way in which power is embedded within particular types of institutions and norms (Adorno, 1973), including the social practices adopted by those institutions.

Organisations, gender equality and negative dialectics

I started this chapter with a discussion about Lacanian lack and its resonance with Adorno's concept of the remainder, highlighting some of the issues associated with a negative ontology predicated on emptiness or absence. In particular, by failing to define diversity, I pointed out that organisations can decide that it means whatever they want it to mean. As such, there is a void at the heart of the concept of diversity itself (Christensen and Muhr, 2018). In this way, it can be argued that organisations practice a kind of discursive closure whereby the statements they make about equality are so empty that they are exempted from having to take any

meaningful action. In addition, these discursive articulations are underpinned by a categorical ontology of gender which further undermines the potential for a genuine commitment to equality. As a result, gender inequality and gendered occupational segmentation are able to persist precisely because of the reified nature of current corporate commitment to women's equality.

This kind of thinking is, however, far removed from corporate diversity discourse. Nor is this surprising given that organisations have to operate within a system that purports to be rational. As such, senior decision-makers are almost bound to struggle to acknowledge that their thinking could be anything other than logical (Stone, 2008). Given that 19 of the 30 organisations in my sample overtly supported diversity because having more women employees in senior management or on the board would improve organisational performance to the extent that it was referred to as a "no-brainer" (Changing People, 2015: webpage), they may be reluctant to consider the possibility of an alternative rationale for supporting greater gender equality (Horkheimer and Adorno, 2002).

Adorno, on the other hand, argued that people should engage with non-identity thinking which "seeks to say what something is" as opposed to the concept that it "comes under" (Adorno, 1973: 149). Contrary to the notion prevalent within the business case that the subject is all-knowing, Adorno argues that there must always be the possibility of non-identity or dialectical thought. In other words, there always has to be the possibility that the concept is not identical with the object. Indeed, he says that the only way to potentially free ourselves from our instincts in terms of dominating nature is by acknowledging that the enlightenment project grew out of it in the first place. In order to bring about change, it is therefore crucial to acknowledge that our thinking grows out of a nature that is very different to rational

thought and that there is always a non-rational aspect to our thinking that resists understanding (Stone, 2008). The question, of course, is whether this kind of abstract thinking is too far removed from organisational practice to be of any value, a point to which I return in my Conclusion.

Conclusion

In this chapter I focused on Adorno's concept of the remainder and its similarity to notions of negative ontology, such as Lacan's concept of the Real, to theorise the failure of organisations to define what they mean by diversity and inclusion. As it lacks meaning, diversity can be understood as a concept which contains an emptiness or absence. Equally, however, this approach can be criticised for undermining the notion of the subject. Adorno's aim, on the other hand, was to analyse the subject-object relation in order to emphasise contradictions and release the remainder.

To this end, I therefore drew on the concept of the remainder to explain the overwhelming tendency of organisations to indulge in a rhetoric about the unique individual whilst simultaneously engaging in the practice of group categorisation. However, as it is only women (not men) who are categorised as members of a group, I noted that references to gender diversity became references to women, leading me to conclude that the unique individual must be a man. This conclusion was underpinned by the ways in which I found men to be privileged within corporate diversity discourse, thereby confirming women as the objects of diversity who constitute no more than the sexed and gendered characteristics attributed to them as gendered organisational subjects.

Given this emphasis on women as objects in this chapter, having referred to the contradictory ways in which they were subjectified in the previous chapter, I explained the difference in meaning between these terms for Adorno and Foucault. At the same time, however, I indicated that these could be reconciled in the sense that women are objectified by virtue of being made "subject to" or subjugated by the power and control of someone else (Foucault, 1982: 781). As a result of the objectification to which women are subject within identity thinking, they are reduced to the sum total of their bodies. Non-identity thinking, on the other hand, makes clear that women must amount to more than their bodies because there is always a remainder.

In addition, because organisations have conflated first nature (the physical world) and second nature (myth or culture) within the diversity discourse, they have, by definition, conflated the concepts of sex and gender with materiality with the result that they do not differentiate between cultural and biological characteristics. Instead they equate the object of woman with the concepts of sex and gender, such that women are perceived to be the equivalent of their gendered characteristics. Although Butler (1990, 1993, 1995) has made this point repeatedly, her insights were purely theoretical and therefore never applied empirically to any specific discourse.

As pointed out in Chapter Three, a dialectical approach requires the concepts of sex and gender to be separated and unpacked in order to liberate the "remainder", as Adorno puts it (Adorno, 1973: 5). For instance, although both Adorno and de Beauvoir acknowledge the importance of materiality or biology they make clear that it does not represent woman's destiny (de Beauvoir, 2011). In other words, they accept the inevitability of materiality but challenge the inevitability of the

social and cultural characteristics that are attributed to that body by identity thinking. As such, there is always something about the object of woman that does not fit into the discursive category of womanhood, thereby allowing for a remainder. By conflating the two, corporate diversity discourse fails to allow for the moment of contradiction between them. As the object of woman is identified as synonymous with the concepts of sex and gender within this discourse, it is hardly surprising that they are also objectified within it. It follows that, as objects, it is only women who have gender.

I then considered the widespread practice by companies in my sample of conflating equal opportunities with diversity noting that it has facilitated a process of instrumentalisation whereby organisations have been enabled to abandon the ethos of social justice under the guise of the identarian discourse of exchange value. By conflating these two concepts, organisations have also succeeded in glossing over the history of inequality against women, representing an era of regress in terms of the struggle for women's equality, underlining Adorno's argument that there is no universal history; only a history that is "the unity of continuity and discontinuity" (Adorno, 1973: 320). I also observed that women have been reduced by the diversity discourse to their "exchange value", again rendering them little more than objects to be managed and controlled in order to achieve certain specific corporate goals and profitability.

Finally, having noted the void or lack which lies at the heart of the diversity discourse, I posited the view that it actually contributes to women's inequality in the sense that it exonerates organisations from having to take responsibility for the lack of progress over the last forty years or so. Indeed, it could be argued that it has made matters worse because it has restricted or even closed the debate down.

Further, organisations can implicitly hold women responsible for their own failure to get to the top through the discourse of neo-liberalism. Given this rather pessimistic backdrop, I go on to consider in my Conclusion what possibilities, if any, exist for change.

CONCLUSION

This thesis has attempted to answer the following three research questions,: 1) Why does inequality in the form of gendered occupational segmentation continue to persist in the UK?; 2) What are the discursive forms through which organisations articulate their commitment to greater gender equality on their websites and in their annual reports?; 3) What insights can be derived from Adorno's critique of identity thinking to explain the persistence of gender inequality in the form of gendered occupational segmentation in the UK? By drawing on Adorno's critique, I concluded that the main reason for the persistence of gendered occupational segmentation in the UK was identity thinking and the essentialist, binary thought processes that underpin it leading to the reification of gender roles.

Although much of the focus of my analysis was therefore on the identitarian nature of corporate diversity discourse, I acknowledged in the first part of Chapter One some of the shifts away from binary thinking that have taken place in relation to feminist thinking, aspects of the media and equality legislation. In the second part of the chapter, I provided a brief overview of the history of gendered occupational segmentation in the UK and explored some of the current patterns relating to both horizontal and vertical segmentation as well as some of the consequences for women and girls, thereby addressing the first of my research questions. In order to assess the different ways in which this phenomenon has been studied within academia, I undertook a review of aspects of feminist organisation studies literature in Chapter Two, starting with a discussion of the "women in management" material which focused on the natural differences between men and women. Although feminist organisation studies scholars have since developed a much more critical analytical lens for studying organisational processes, they have tended to focus on

poststructural explanations rather than Adorno's critique of identity thinking. Likewise, critical diversity scholars have developed a non-essentialist understanding of the diversity discourse but without explicit reference to Adorno's critique. I concluded the literature review with an overview of selected gender-fluid literature, including queer theory and the Deleuzian category of "becoming" woman (Deleuze and Guattari, 2003: 275).

As much of this literature was also underpinned by binary thought, I went on in Chapter Three to show how Adorno's critical theory can help to explain this kind of thinking and how it contributes to the persistence of gendered occupational segmentation. In particular, I focused on his critique of identity thinking which explains that our need to classify and categorise the things around us in order to make sense of the world leads to a tendency towards essentialism and the reification of gender roles. He also criticized the assumption inherent within identity thinking that there is no more to the objects of our perception than the classifications that we make of them. Rather, he argued that there is always something left over because each object has particular qualities and it is those particular qualities that constitute its non-identical aspects. By allowing for the non-identical, Adorno suggests that we can make way for difference in the world. In the second part of Chapter Three, I showed how Adorno's theories complemented and contributed to feminist literature by, among other things, shifting the focus away from the concepts of sex and gender per se and onto the identity thinking that generates it. In particular, I suggested that Adorno's critique could help to resolve some of the theoretical differences between feminist critical theorists who are concerned that it is impossible to advocate for women's emancipation if the category of "woman" cannot

be defined, as opposed to poststructuralists who reject totalising theories, arguing that the term "woman" has to be released from a fixed, essentialist referent.

Chapter Four focused on my methodology where I firstly explained the rationale for carrying out a critical discourse analysis of corporate website pages, the results of which are set out in Chapter Five. This was based on Foucault's understanding of discourse which focuses on the ways in which things (objects) are brought into being and given meaning. In particular he was interested in the body of rules through which discursive practices are formed and power is exercised in terms of subject formation. However, given the importance of Adorno's thinking to my analysis, I also explained in this chapter the ways in which the concepts within his critique could be operationalised to help explain and analyse the findings from my data in Chapter Six. In particular, I drew on the technique of immanent critique which aims to unsettle the object of study and how it perceives itself. By adopting these methodologies, I sought to develop a critical analysis of the ways in which corporate diversity discourse is predicated on the categorisation and classification of organisational subjectivities.

In terms of method, I carried out a critical discourse analysis of the text and images contained in the websites and annual reports of 30 FTSE 100 companies (the top 15 and bottom 15 of the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report) in order to answer my second research question. By adopting a critical, discursive approach to the data, I identified some of the ways in which corporations construct women as different, as outsiders and as deficient based on assumptions that appear to be neutral but which impact in very specific ways on women. Much of the discourse was also contradictory – for instance, I found that women were simultaneously positioned as both perfect and imperfect subjects. In addition, I

noted that corporate diversity discourse was predicated on essentialist stereotypes of women, underpinning the notion that men hold power because that is deemed to be the natural order of things. My main finding from this chapter was that women were discursively constructed within corporate diversity discourse as subjects who have certain innate, essential qualities which companies ostensibly value because of their potential to increase profitability.

In terms of my ontological lens, I drew on Adorno's critique of identity thinking to explain this main finding at a more abstract level in Chapter Six, which helped to answer the third research question. In particular, I focused on his notion of the remainder which is predicated on the understanding that each object is unique, meaning that there is always something left over. In large part, this chapter centred on the relationship between the subject and the object, thereby enabling me to highlight the different ways in which women are constructed within corporate diversity discourse as objects to be managed. As identity thinking assumes that the object equals the concept, I found that these characteristics were assumed to constitute the totality of womanhood within this discourse. In other words, women were constructed as subjects with innate, essentialist qualities who amount to no more than their sexed and gendered characteristics. In addition, by viewing women as objects within the discursive category of gender diversity, corporations have buried their unique qualities rather than bringing them to the fore, which is their purported aim. As such, corporate diversity discourse has engaged in a form of discursive closure, making gender inequality less, rather than more, likely.

Contributions

As highlighted in Chapter Two, CDS scholars have written about gender inequality by focusing broadly on the concepts of difference and inclusion (Ahonen et al., 2014; Dobusch, 2014; Ghorashi and Sabelis, 2013; Jonsen et al., 2019); essentialism (Dzubinski and Diehl, 2018; Dye and Golnaraghi, 2015; Humbert et al., 2018), and the tendency within organisations to categorise and classify people into groups (Christensen and Muhr, 2018; Köllen et al., 2018; Ozbilgin and Tatli, 2011; Romani et al., 2019). Feminist scholars, on the other hand, have tended to focus on the concepts of sex and gender (Butler, 1990a; Butler, 1993; Duford, 2017; Wittig, 1993); while feminist organisation studies scholars have focused mainly on discursive explanations (Ashcraft and Mumby, 2004; Calás and Smircich, 2006; Calás et al., 2014). However, as indicated in previous chapters, none of these bodies of literature have considered how Adorno's critique can analyse the ways in which the particular, individual characteristics of women have become equated with the universal concept of womanhood.

By cohering the various concepts mobilized by these schools of thought, whilst conceptualizing them within the broader analytical framework of identity and non-identity thinking, I have been able to make a number of contributions to the extant literature. Firstly, my theoretical approach has allowed me to revitalize the link between CMS and feminist organisation studies. Secondly, it has allowed me to bridge the theoretical gap between feminist critical theorists and poststructuralists. Thirdly, it has allowed me to demonstrate how diversity discourse can be viewed as a type of discursive closure such that it cannot lead to greater equality for women because of the way in which women's bodies have become equated with their sexed and gendered characteristics. Finally, I offer the thought that, rather than focusing

on the concepts of sex and gender, feminist scholars should concentrate on going behind the binary, rather than beyond it.

Firstly, as explained in Chapter Two, the CMS label entered the critical organisation studies lexicon in the mid-1980s. Although it encompasses many schools of thought, I focused in my literature review on two main streams – the Frankfurt School and poststructuralism. Despite an initial commitment to Adorno's dialectical approach (Alvesson, 1985; Benson, 1977; Neimark and Tinker, 1987), CMS scholars subsequently shifted their focus onto concepts such as micro-emancipation (Alvesson and Willmott, 1992b: 446; Alvesson, 1996) and critical performativity (Spicer et al., 2009; Spicer et al., 2016), overlooking the role of gender within organisations. Critical organisation studies scholars, on the other hand, tended to focus on Adorno's aesthetic theory (Carr, 2003; Cohen et al., 2006; Cox and Minahan, 2005) and his critique of the culture industry (Böhm and Batta, 2010; Hoof and Boell, 2019; Jones et al., 2016; Larsen, 2017). In other words, although CMS and organisation studies scholars have drawn on different aspects of Adorno's theories, they have overlooked not just his critique of identity thinking but also how it might apply to an understanding of the dynamics of gender within organisations. Feminist organisation studies scholars, on the other hand, have tended to draw on aspects of poststructural theory to challenge taken for granted assumptions around gender, particularly in relation to the ways in which discourses structure gendered organisational subjectivities and subject positions (Ashcraft and Mumby, 2004; Calás and Smircich, 2006; Calás et al., 2014). Having adopted an overtly poststructural approach to organisation studies with a focus on discourse, however, they have also overlooked Adorno's critique as a means of analysing aspects of gender relations within organisations. In other words, although these

bodies of literature have mobilized different aspects of Adorno's wide body of philosophical theory, they have overlooked his critique of identity thinking as an analytical tool to theorise the concepts of sex and gender within diversity discourse. My study, on the other hand, revitalizes the connection between CMS and the critical poststructural theories of feminist organisational scholarship through a mobilization of his critique.

Secondly, as explained in Chapter Three, feminists have grappled with the concepts of sex and gender over many decades, highlighting the parameters of the regulatory ideals within which women are required to perform these constructs in order to "become" women (Butler, 1990a; Butler, 1993; de Beauvoir, 2011; Wittig, 1993). Although some feminist writers have drawn on aspects of non-identity thinking (such as de Beauvoir's concept of the situation or Butler's concept of performativity), they have also not explicitly drawn on Adorno's critique to explain the ways in which these constructs can be analysed in terms of the relationship between subjects and objects. In other words, they have not engaged in a direct analysis of the relationship between the concepts of sex and gender and the object of the body. Adorno's critique, by contrast, shifts the parameters of the debate by focusing on the thinking that lies behind the concepts of sex and gender and the ways in which they have become equated with the object of the body.

In so doing, I have demonstrated the ways in which Adorno's critique can bridge the theoretical divide between feminist critical theorists and poststructuralists. As discussed in Chapter Three, Benhabib (1995) argued that, by challenging the notion of the subject, poststructuralists threatened to undermine the feminist commitment to women's agency and selfhood. Moreover, she questioned how feminist politics could survive the anti-essentialism of poststructuralism which denied

that there was a coherent group of people who could be identified as women (Canaday, 2003). Whilst not disputing that it is necessary to speak as and for women, Butler (1995: 50) argued that women's agency could only come about by releasing them from "a fixed referent" in order to expand the possibility of what it means to be a woman, thereby opening up the term to a "reusage or redefinition that previously has not been authorised" (Butler, 1995: 49). The question remains, however, as to how feminists can agitate for the liberation of women as a group if it is not possible to define membership of that group. Conversely, it is not clear how the "totalising concept of the universal" articulated by Benhabib (Butler, 1995: 41) can avoid foreclosing advance future claims for inclusion in the definition of woman. Indeed, this tension lies at the heart of the current debate between some members of the trans community and so-called TERFs, as indicated in Chapter One. It is, however, possible to resolve these seemingly intractable positions by mobilising Adorno's critique of identity thinking. Firstly, by arguing for the priority of the object but without abandoning the subject, Adorno's critique addresses Benhabib's concern about women's lack of agency and selfhood within poststructuralism. Secondly, by emphasising the dissonance between the subject and the object, his approach allows the term "woman" to mean something other than we declare her to be, thereby addressing one of Butler's concerns. In short, Adorno's critique allows feminists to be critical of the categorisation inherent within identity thinking whilst continuing to advocate for the treatment of women as an oppressed group.

In terms of my third contribution to the extant literature, I made the link at an empirical level between Adorno's critique of identity thinking, his theory of negative dialectics and the concepts of sex and gender within organisations in order to explain the reification of gender roles in underpinning gendered occupational

segmentation. Although feminist organisation studies scholars such as Calás and Smircich (1996, 1999, 2006, 2014) have highlighted the significance of analysing women's inequality in the labour market through the primacy of discourse, they overlooked the ways in which Adorno's critique can help to take the analysis further. Adorno argues that we live in a subjectivistic hierarchical world in which subjects classify and categorise the things around them not just to make sense of them, but also to dominate them (Adorno, 1973). Having made all possible classifications, subjects assume that there is nothing more to be said about the object. My argument is that the same principles apply to organisational diversity discourse which presents women as a group with certain essential qualities, as opposed to individuals with unique qualities. It follows that, because of their association with nature, women's bodies have come to be constructed as objects which amount to no more than the sum total of their sexed and gendered characteristics within diversity discourse. As such, my analysis leads me to suggest that, for as long as organisations continue to support the business case which is predicated on fixed, essentialist notions of women, gender diversity discourse cannot lead to change in the form of greater equality for women. This analysis is underpinned by a diversity discourse replete with empty signifiers which can be defined in a myriad of different ways, all of which fail to provide any real insight into what it means. As such, this failure to define diversity can be interpreted as a form of discursive closure which operates against the goal of greater gender equality, as discussed in the last chapter.

Finally, by drawing on Adorno's critique, I suggested that rather than focus on the concepts of sex and gender, as many feminist scholars have done, they might focus instead on the identity thinking that lies behind the construction of these

concepts. In other words, to go behind the binary, rather than beyond it. That is not to disparage the value of past feminist analysis but rather to build on the ideas of second wave feminists who identified sex as a biological term and gender as a cultural one (Oakley, 1972; Rubin, 1975), a perspective that was later developed and revised by Butler (1990a, 1993). Her theory can, however, be taken a stage further by arguing that, if sex and gender are both constructs, then rather than focusing on the concepts per se, feminists could frame their analysis around the difference or the "remainder" (Adorno, 1973: 5) that emerges between subject and object within non-identity thinking, thereby highlighting the understanding that women amount to more than the sum total of those characteristics. Once it becomes apparent that the body amounts to more than its gendered characteristics, then scholars can start to consider what is left over whilst simultaneously drawing attention to the essentialist and binary nature of identity thinking. In this way, non-identity thinking breaks through the confines of subjectivistic thought and opens the way to the creation of something new (Holloway et al., 2009), allowing the possibility of a contradictory social reality to be revealed (Dineen, 2011).

Limitations

Although there were many advantages to my documentary methodology, as indicated in Chapter Four, there were also some important limitations. The following section offers a discussion of some of these as well as some suggestions for future research. The most important (and perhaps most obvious) limitation was that I used one research method – documentary analysis. As this meant that I could not discuss and comment on the ways in which employees experience corporate diversity discourse, this aspect of the study remains unresearched (Maier and Ravazzani, 2018). Had I adopted a different methodological approach, such as interviews

and/or an ethnographic study, other valuable insights would undoubtedly have emerged. For instance, these methods might have allowed me to explore the potential gap between what companies say and how that discourse is actually experienced or felt by individuals on a day-to-day basis. However, because of difficulties in securing access to organisations with all the concomitant time constraints associated with those difficulties, I took the decision in early 2017 not to pursue this approach. Instead I decided to undertake a documentary critical discourse analysis which, for all the reasons set out in Chapter Four, was an appropriate method in terms of answering my research questions.

It might also be productive, as part of a future project, to ask why men are over-represented in top management and on the boards of companies, as opposed to considering the issue of women's under-representation. Although I acknowledged men's privileged position in terms of being the "unencumbered worker" (Lewis et al., 2017: 219) as part of my analysis, my research did not relate to men except in a binary way as the corollary of women. Turning the question round in this way might also help to answer why other groups (such as the disabled, those from minority ethnic backgrounds, LGBTQ+ and so forth) are also under-represented in top jobs, thereby introducing some intersectionality into the analysis which is currently lacking.

There are, of course, other limitations to the study. In particular, it was restricted to FTSE100 companies which have consistently had a higher number of female executive and non-executive directors on their boards compared to FTSE 250 companies. It might therefore be useful to try to find out the reasons behind this discrepancy. In addition, there is a major disparity between the number of women in non-executive as opposed to executive directorships within both the FTSE 100 and

250 which might make an interesting topic for future research. This could be linked to an inquiry into the various programmes and practices introduced by different companies ostensibly to increase the number of women on their boards in order to find out why they have been introduced, why they are not assessed or, if they are, why the assessments are not made public.

In terms of conceptual limitations, I acknowledge that my primary interests settled on the concepts identified by other, mainly critical organisational and diversity scholars fairly early on in the research process, including the primacy of language, the role of the subject, binary thinking, essentialism and instrumental rationality. These concepts also resonated with the critical approach I adopted for analysing diversity discourse. However, by taking this approach I accept that I may have underplayed the importance of some organisation studies scholarship particularly in relation to non-binary, more fluid thinking that might have proved apposite in terms of analysing corporate discourse. Having said that however, given the various constraints inherent within a doctoral thesis, it was not possible to pursue this school of thought more fully. By providing a broad outline of some of the main concepts, I hope to have indicated my awareness of their importance and their usefulness in future research. Likewise, I was unable to pursue much feminist scholarship apart from a brief overview of the main works of de Beauvoir and Butler. As a result, I was not able to study the work of authors such as Irigaray, particularly in relation to her writings on woman as object as well as in terms of the concept of the "remainder" (Irigaray, 1985: 224). Given Adorno's emphasis on the priority of the object and the concept of difference or remainder, this would very likely be an instructive area of research to pursue in the future.

Although this acknowledgement might prompt some scholars to ask why I did not draw more heavily on feminist scholarship as opposed to one of the "great men" of critical theory (Bell et al., 2019: 14), I would suggest that it is not necessarily useful to make a distinction between Adorno's critical theory and critical feminist scholarship, given the extent to which the two complement each other. Indeed, the thesis as a whole has highlighted the many different ways in which Adorno's critical scholarship complements and supports aspects of feminist thinking, as well as supplementing the disciplines of critical diversity and feminist organisation studies. In particular, as discussed in Chapter Three, he can be said to have pre-empted both de Beauvoir and Butler in his observation that "female psychology" (Ziege, 2003: unnumbered) was based not in biology but was instead the result of social conditioning.

Reflections

When reflecting on the process of writing this thesis, I looked back at the research proposal that I submitted to the ESRC in order to remind myself of my original interests and objectives. This exercise made me realise how much my focus has changed in four years given that my idea at that point was to write a thesis on the role that statutory gender quotas might play in terms of improving the under-representation of women on boards in the UK. However, this interest shifted from the point at which I discovered Adorno's critique of identity thinking. I was initially intrigued by his analysis of the ways in which human beings classify and categorise the world around them and wondered if this understanding might provide a new perspective with which to approach the study of gendered occupational segmentation. However, the more I read, the more fascinated I became as other aspects of his theory opened up. For instance, the way he identified the difference

between subject and object, the remainder that this produced, his inquiry into natural history, his understanding of coercion and his analysis of the extent to which people have internalised instrumental reason.

Despite having strayed from the original topic idea for my PhD, however, there are important threads of connection between where I started and where I finished. Firstly I retained an interest in women's workplace equality, specifically gendered occupational segmentation. Although I shifted from a focus on women on boards, this was because much of the material I analysed was not directed solely at women in the boardroom but at gender equality more broadly. On the other hand, the companies I chose were based on the rankings set out in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report, as indicated earlier. Secondly, I retained an interest in writing a thesis that crosses academic boundaries between philosophy, critical diversity and feminist organisation studies. As I was not familiar with any of these subjects, the learning curve has, at times, been extremely steep. I have also learnt a huge amount particularly in relation to Adorno's philosophy which has, in turn, transformed the way I think about the external world. In particular, I have become much more conscious of the ways in which I repeatedly classify and categorise the people and things around me. That is not necessarily a bad thing, as Adorno makes clear, but I do feel fortunate to have had the opportunity to read his work in some detail and therefore to have had the time to become more aware of how these processes operate at a sub-conscious level.

Thirdly I retained my interest in the overriding motivation I had at the start for writing this thesis. That is, a passion for social justice and a feeling of despair mixed with outrage that women are still suffering injustices both at work and in the home in the twenty first century. Although we have come a long way in the last 100 or so

years, I sometimes wonder how embedded this progress actually is, particularly in relation to the essentialist nature of corporate diversity discourse and the extent to which it underpins the perception that women have a particular set of characteristics, qua women, which differ from those of men. It is particularly depressing that some companies such as Unilever have recognised that these essentialist stereotypes are contributing to the ever-widening gender gap whilst at the same time giving its support to the business case which is, itself, predicated on the very same stereotypes. These findings are not just frustrating; they also made me feel very powerless. That is, unless this thesis can, in some way, contribute to the ongoing academic debate, as I now consider.

Final thoughts

As indicated in the Introduction, this thesis is, at least to some extent, both theoretical as well as empirical. I also made clear at the outset that it is not a template for action about what can be done in relation to the ways in which identity thinking dominates corporate diversity discourse. Nor does it set out what corporate non-identity thinking might look like. It is, in other words, an analysis, not a charter for revolution or even reform. This reflects Adorno's view that change can only come through critical theory (Adorno, 2008) or through the prism of art which he viewed "as liberating, as transgressive" (O'Neill, 1999: 37) in the sense that it can resist the tendency of the external world to categorise despite being governed by the same rationality (López, 1999).

There are obvious problems with Adorno's approach, however, in that critical theorists who follow his lead may become caught up in an "academic hall of mirrors" (Butler et al., 2018: 429) that has little or no relevance to the needs and interests of practitioners. This can only compound the tensions between academic theory and

organisational practice identified by CMS scholars (Butler et al., 2018; Fournier and Grey, 2000; Visser, 2019). I therefore acknowledge that my approach leaves me open to criticisms of utopianism, although that is not to say that abstract discussions and considerations are of no practical use and cannot lead to social change (Contu, 2019; Fleming and Banerjee, 2016). Indeed, as Fleming and Banerjee (2016) point out, utopianism has long played a fundamental role in social progress campaigns through a process of exploration and analysis of the complex ideas that sustain dominant ideologies.

I would therefore like to finish by suggesting that it is precisely because of the abstract nature of Adorno's theory that it can contribute to the academic debate around corporate diversity discourse and occupational segmentation. Despite the complexity of his ontology, there are two broad points that are fundamental to his philosophy. Firstly his critique of identity thinking has facilitated my analysis that occupational segmentation persists because it is predicated on a classificatory system of cognition which is necessary for us to make sense of the world. Secondly, however, it is not a totalising form of cognition as long as we can manage to acknowledge "our own moment of non-identity" (Dews, 1986: 39). In other words, change is possible. The challenge, of course, both for myself and other critical scholars is how to achieve that moment of reflexivity in order to bring about change in a reified society that continually seems to resist the opportunity to do so. It is not an easy or straightforward goal but my hope is that, by showing the real and genuine possibilities offered by Adorno's critique, other scholars will go on to develop a practical plan of action, predicated directly on my conclusion in this thesis that gendered occupational segmentation in the UK is driven by essentialism which originates in and stems from identity thinking.

Appendix One: brief overview of companies

Top 15, Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report

Diageo plc

Diageo is a global leader in beverage alcohol, employing about 32,000 people, about a third of whom are women. It owns brands such as Johnnie Walker, Crown Royal, J&B, Buchanan's and Windsor whiskies, Smirnoff, Cîroc and Ketel One vodkas, Captain Morgan, Baileys, Don Julio, Tanqueray and Guinness. It topped the Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report from 2014 to 2016.

Next plc

Next plc is a UK-based retailer selling clothing, footwear, accessories and home products from more than 500 stores in the UK and Ireland and around 200 stores in 40 countries overseas. It has over 50,000 employees, 34,000 of whom are women. It was rated joint no 2 in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation (along with Kingfisher plc).

Kingfisher plc

Kingfisher plc operates over 1,100 stores across Europe specialising in home improvement products. It employs 74,000 people, 39% of whom are women. It was rated joint no 2 in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report (along with Next plc) in terms of board representation. The CEO is a woman as is the CFO.

Unilever plc

Unilever is a global company supplying food, home care, personal care and refreshment products in over 190 countries. It has 169,000 employees, 32% of whom are female. It was rated no 4 in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

Legal & General Group plc

L&G, one of the world's largest insurance and investment management groups, is also one of the world's top ten asset managers. It has 8,000 employees (split almost evenly between men and women) and 10 million customers worldwide. It was rated no 5 (joint with Whitbread) in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

Whitbread plc

Whitbread is the UK's leading hospitality company with 50,000 employees (38% of whom are women) serving about 27 million customers every day. It was rated no 5 (joint with Legal & General) in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation. Its CEO is a woman.

Old Mutual plc

The Old Mutual plc is a leading UK and cross-border wealth manager, with just over 64,000 employees, 58% of whom are female. It has 18.9 million customers in over 30 countries, with Africa accounting for 67% of its profits (62% of them in South Africa). It was rated no 7 in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

Royal Mail plc

Royal Mail is a letter and parcels delivery service, based mainly in the UK. In total, it employs about 156,000 people across the group, about 16% of whom are women. It was rated no 8 in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation. Its CEO was a woman until 2018.

3i Group plc

3i Group is an international investment management company specialising in core investment markets in northern Europe and North America. It has 281 employees (107 are female, 174 are male) across nine offices. It was rated joint no 8 in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

Burberry Group plc

Burberry Group is a British luxury fashion house, specialising in ready-to-wear outerwear employing almost 11,000 people (67% of them women) across 34 countries and 112 nationalities. It was rated joint no 10 (with Marks & Spencer) in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

Marks & Spencer plc

M&S is a leading UK retailer, with over 1,382 stores in the UK and internationally. It employs 83,000 people worldwide (72% of whom are women), although 90% of them are based in the UK. It was rated no 10 (joint with Burberry) in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

Intercontinental Hotels Group plc

IHG operates 5,174 hotels, directly employing approximately 33,000 people, 57% of whom are women. It was rated no 12 (joint with Land Securities Group plc, Merlin Entertainments, Astrazenca, Admiral Group, Intertek Group, SSE plc and Standard Life) in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

Land Securities Group plc

Land Securities Group owns and manages over 23.6 million sq feet of property, making it the largest commercial property company in the UK. It employs approximately 630 employees, 53% of whom are women. It was rated no 12 (joint with IHG, Merlin Entertainments, Astrazenca, Admiral Group, Intertek Group, SSE

plc and Standard Life) in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

Merlin Entertainments

The mission of Merlin Entertainments plc is to create "magical and memorable experiences" (Merlin Entertainments, Undated). Just under 4,000 (or 49%) of permanent employees are women. Merlin was rated no 12 (along with Admiral Group) in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

Astrazeneca plc

Astrazeneca is a major pharmaceutical company employing a global workforce of around 61,500 people in more than 100 countries. It employs 6,700 people in the UK on seven sites, half of whom are women. It was rated no 12 (joint with IHG, Land Securities Group plc, Merlin Entertainments, Admiral Group, Intertek Group, SSE plc and Standard Life) in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

Bottom 15, Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report

Hammerson plc

Hammerson owns, manages and develops retail destinations in the UK and Europe such as shopping centres and retail parks. It employs just over 550 staff, 50% of whom are women. It was rated no 80 (jointly with Schroders plc, Ashtead Group plc, Sabmiller plc, RSA Insurance Group plc and Experian plc) in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

Prudential plc

Prudential is an international financial services group offering long-term savings and protection products, retirement income solutions and asset management. It employs just over 23,500 staff worldwide, 53% of whom are women. It was rated no 87 in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

Paddy Power Betfair plc

Paddy Power Betfair is an international, multi-channel sports betting and gaming operator. It employs just over 7,300 staff worldwide, 39% of whom are women. It was rated joint no 88 (with Sky plc) in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation. The merged company of Paddy Power and Betfair joined the FTSE 100 in 2016.

Sky plc

Sky advertises itself as Europe's leading entertainment and communications business. It employs about 30,000 staff worldwide, about a third of whom are women. It was rated joint no 88 (with Paddy Power Betfair plc) in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

Inmarsat plc

Inmarsat plc is the market leader in the provision of mobile satellite services, with the largest portfolio of global satellite communications solutions and value-added services on the market. It employs about 1800 staff worldwide, 30% of whom are women. It was rated joint no 90 (with Babcock International Group, Centrica and Fresnillo) in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

Babcock International Group plc

Babcock International Group plc provides engineering, technical and training services around the world. It employs about 35,000 staff worldwide, 19% of whom are women. It was rated joint no 90 (with Inmarsat, Centrica and Fresnillo) in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

Centrica plc

Centrica is an energy and services company operating mainly in the UK and North America. It employs just under 36,500 people worldwide, 27% of whom are women. It was rated joint no 90 (with Inmarsat, Babcock International Group and Fresnillo) in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

Fresnillo plc

Fresnillo is a mining company which produces gold and silver from six locations across Mexico. It is the world's largest primary silver producer and one of the largest gold producers in Mexico. About 8.5% of its employees are women. It was rated joint no 90 (with Immarsat, Babcock International Group and Centrica) in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

Coca-Cola HBC AG

Coca-Cola HBC AG is one of the world's largest bottlers for the Coca-Cola company, meaning that it manufactures and sells concentrates, bases and syrups to its bottling partners, owns the brands and is responsible for consumer brand marketing initiatives. It employs just over 31,000 people, about 23% of whom are women. It was rated no 94 in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

Glencore plc

Glencore is a leading integrated commodity producer and trader, operating worldwide encompassing metals and minerals, energy and agricultural products as well as related marketing and logistics activities. It employs just under 155,000 people, 17% of whom are women. It was rated no 95 in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

GKN plc

GKN is a global engineering business which designs, manufactures and services systems and components for most of the world's leading aircraft, vehicle and

machinery manufacturers. It employs about 50,000 people of whom almost a fifth are women. It was rated no 96 (joint with Worldpay Group) in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

Worldpay Group plc

The Worldpay Group specialises in card payments, multi-currency processing, online payments and contactless for in-store, online and mobile payments. It employs about 5,000 colleagues in its corporate headquarters in London and 25 offices in 11 countries around the world, 40% of whom are women. It was rated no 96 (joint with GKN) in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

Mediclinic International plc

Mediclinic International is a private hospital group with three operating platforms in Southern Africa (South Africa and Namibia), Switzerland and the United Arab Emirates. It has just under 30,000 employees, 78% of whom are women. It was rated no 98 (joint with London Stock Exchange Group and Antofagasta) in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

London Stock Exchange Group plc

The London Stock Exchange Group is a British-based stock exchange and financial information company with headquarters in London. It has approximately 3,600 employees, just under a third of whom are women. It was rated no 98 (joint with Mediclinic International and Antofagasta) in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

Antofagasta plc

Antofagasta is a Chilean-based copper mining group which also has interests in transportation. It employs about 5,400 people, 10% of whom are women. It was rated no 98 (joint with Mediclinic International and the London Stock Exchange Group) in the 2016 Cranfield Female FTSE Board Report in terms of board representation.

References

3I GROUP PLC 2016. Annual accounts and report 2016.

ABBOTT, P., WALLACE, C. & TYLER, M. 2005. *An introduction to sociology : feminist perspectives,* Abingdon, Routledge.

ACKER, J. 1990. Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organisations. *Gender & Society,* 4 (2)**,** 139-158.

ACKER, J. 1992. From Sex Roles to Gendered Institutions. *Contemporary Sociology,* 21 (5)**,** 565-569.

ADAMS, R. B. & FERREIRA, D. 2009. Women in the boardroom and their impact on governance and performance. *Journal of Financial Economics,* 94 (2)**,** 291-309.

ADAMSON, M. 2017. Postfeminism, Neoliberalism and A 'Successfully' Balanced Femininity in Celebrity CEO Autobiographies. *Gender, Work & Organization,* 24 (3)**,** 314-327.

ADMIRAL GROUP. 2017. *Today is Zero Discrimination Day!* [Online]. Available: https://admiraljobs.co.uk/inside-admiral/post/186/Today-is-Zero-Discrimination-Day! [Accessed 14 February 2017].

ADORNO, T. W. 1973. *Negative dialectics,* London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

ADORNO, T. W. 1975. The culture industry revisited. *New German Critique,* 6 (Autumn)**,** 12-19.

ADORNO, T. W. 1982. *Against Epistemology: A Metacritique. Studies in Husserl and the Phenomenological Antinomies,* Cambridge, Polity Press.

ADORNO, T. W. 1984. The Idea of Natural History. *Telos,* 60**,** 97-124.

ADORNO, T. W. 1994. *Adorno : the stars down to earth and other essays on the irrational in culture,* London, Routledge.

ADORNO, T. W. 1998. Subject and Object. *In:* ARATO, A. & GEBHARDT, E. (eds.) *The Essential Frankfurt School Reader.* New York: Continuum.

ADORNO, T. W. 2005. *Minima Moralia, Reflections from Damaged Life,* London, New York, Verso.

ADORNO, T. W. 2006a. *History and freedom : lectures 1964-1965,* Cambridge, Polity.

ADORNO, T. W. 2006b. The Idea of Natural-History. *In:* HULLOT-KENTOR, R. (ed.) *Things Beyond Resemblance: Collected Essays on Theodor W. Adorno.* New York: Columbia University Press.

ADORNO, T. W. 2008. *Lectures on Negative Dialectics,* Cambridge, Polity Press.

ADVERTISING STANDARDS AUTHORITY. 2018. *Harmful Gender Stereotypes in Ads to be Banned* [Online]. Available: https://www.asa.org.uk/news/harmful-gender-stereotypes-in-ads-to-be-banned.html [Accessed 31 December 2018].

AHERN, I. R. & DITTMAR, A. K. 2012. The Changing of the Boards: The Impact on Firm Valuation of Mandated Female Board Representation. *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 127 (1)**,** 137-197.

AHL, H. 2007. A Fooucauldian framework for discourse analysis. *In:* NEERGAARD, H. & ULHØI, J. (eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods in Entrepreneurship.* Cheltenham, UK; Northampton, USA: Edward Elgar.

AHMED, S. 2006. *Queer Phenomenology. Orientations, Objects, Others.,* Durham and London, Duke University Press.

AHMED, S. 2007. The language of diversity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 30 (2)**,** 235-256.

AHONEN, P., TIENARI, J., MERILAINEN, S. & PULLEN, A. 2014. Hidden contexts and invisible power relations: A Foucauldian reading of diversity research. *Human Relations,* 67 (3)**,** 263-286.

ALBERTS, P. 2013. Foucault, Nature and the Environment. *In:* FALZON, C., O'LEARY, T. & SAWICKI, J. (eds.) *A Companion to Foucault.* Maldon: Wiley-Blackwell.

ALLEN, A. 1996. Foucault on Power: A Theory for Feminists. *In:* HEKMAN, S. J. (ed.) *Feminist Interpretations of Michel Foucault.* Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University.

ALLEN, A. 2017. Adorno, Foucault and the End of Progress: Critical Theory in Postcolonial Times. *In:* DEUTSCHER, P. & LAFONT, C. (eds.) *Critical Theory in Critical Times: Transforming the Global, Political & Economic Order.* New York: Columbia University Press.

ALVESSON, M. 1985. A Critical Framework for Organizational Analysis. *Organization Studies,* 6 (2)**,** 117-138.

ALVESSON, M. 1996. *Making sense of management : a critical introduction,* London, Sage.

ALVESSON, M. & DEETZ, S. 2006. Critical Theory and Postmodernism Approaches to Organizational Studies. *In:* CLEGG, S., HARDY, C., LAWRENCE, T. & NORD, W. (eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Organization Studies.* 2nd ed. London: Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

ALVESSON, M. & DUE BILLING, Y. 1992. Gender and Organization - Towards a Differentiated Understanding. *Organization Studies* 13 (1)**,** 73-102.

ALVESSON, M. & KÄRREMAN, D. 2000. Varieties of discourse: on the study of organizations through discourse analysis. *Human Relations,* 53**,** 1125-49.

ALVESSON, M. & WILLMOTT, H. 1992a. Critical Theory and Management Studies: An Introduction. *In:* ALVESSON, M. & WILLMOTT, H. (eds.) *Critical Management Studies.* London and New Delhi: SAGE

ALVESSON, M. & WILLMOTT, H. 1992b. On the Idea of Emancipation in Management and Organization Studies. *The Academy of Management Review,* 17 (3)**,** 432-464.

ANAÏS, S. 2013. Genealogy and critical discourse analysis in conversation: texts, discourse, critique. *Critical Discourse Studies,* 10 (2)**,** 123-135.

ANDERSON, C. & IMPERIA, G. 1992. The Corporate Annual Report: A Photo Analysis of Male and Female Portrayals. *The Journal of Business Communication,* 29 (2)**,** 113-128.

ANDERSSON, A. & HATAKKA, M. 2017. Victim, mother or untapped resource? Discourse analysis of the construction of women in ICT policies. *Information Technologies & International Development,* 13**,** 72-86.

ANKER, R. 1997. Theories of occupational segregation by sex: An overview. *International Labour Review,* 136 (3)**,** 315-339.

ANTOFAGASTA MINERALS 2015. Annual report 2015.

ASHCRAFT, K. 2016. Fringe benefits? Revisi(ti)ng the relationship between feminism and Critical Management Studies. *In:* PRASAD, A., PRASAD, P., MILLS, A. J. & MILLS, J. (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Critical Management Studies.* Abingdon: Routledge.

ASHCRAFT, K. & MUMBY, D. 2004. Organizing a critical communicology of gender and work. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language,* 166**,** 19-43.

ASIRVATHAM, S. & HUMPHRIES, M. 2019. Changing agents of change in neoliberally framed organizations. *Gender in Management: An International Journal,* 34 (1)**,** 45-58.

ATKINSON, P. & COFFEY, A. 2004. Analysing documentary realities. *In:* SILVERMAN, D. (ed.) *Qualitative research : theory, method and practice.* 2nd ed. London: Sage.

AZMANOVA, A. 2012. De-gendering social justice in the 21st century: An immanent critique of neoliberal capitalism. *European Journal of Social Theory,* 15 (2)**,** 143-156.

BABCOCK INTERNATIONAL GROUP PLC. Undated. *People and potential* [Online]. [Accessed 6 June 2017].

BACCHI, C. & BONHAM, J. 2014. Reclaiming discursive practices as an analytical focus: practical implications. *Foucault Studies,* 17**,** 173-192.

BAETENS, J. & SURDIACOURT, S. 2011. How to "Read" Images with Texts: The Graphic Novel case. *In:* MARGOLIS, E. & PAUWELS, L. (eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Visual Research Methods.* Los Angeles, London, New Delhi: Sage.

BARAD, K. 2003. Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of How Matter Comes to Matter *Signs,* 28 (3)**,** 801-831.

BARRY, B. 2018. (Re)Fashioning Masculinity: Social Identity and Context in Men's Hybrid Masculinities through Dress. *Gender & Society,* 32 (5)**,** 638-662.

BATTERSBY, C. 1998. *The Phenomenal Woman. Feminist Metaphysics and the Patterns of Identity,* Cambridge, Polity Press.

BAUER, K. 1999. *Adorno's Nietzschean Narratives: Critiques of Ideology, Readings of Wagner,* New York, State University of New York Press.

BAXTER, J. 2003. *Positioning gender in discourse : a feminist methodology,* Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.

BBC. 2018. *Gender and transgender issues* [Online]. Available: https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p06p9k34 [Accessed 23 November 2018].

BECKER-SCHMIDT, R. 1999. Critical Theory as a Critique of Society: Theodor W Adorno's Significance for a Feminist Sociology. *In:* O'NEILL, M. (ed.) *Adorno, Culture and Feminism.* Torquay: The Cromwell Press Ltd.

BECKER, G. S. 1964. Human capital ; a theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education

BELL, E., MERILÄINEN, S., TAYLOR, S. & TIENARI, J. 2019. Time's up! Feminist theory and activism meets organization studies. *Human Relations,* 72 (1)**,** 4–22.

BENDIX, T. 2017. *25 Songs About Gender Identity* [Online]. Available: https://www.billboard.com/articles/news/pride/7966104/25-songs-about-gender-identity [Accessed 3 December 2018].

BENHABIB, S. 1992. *Situating the Self: Gender, Community and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics,* Cambridge, Polity.

BENHABIB, S. 1995. Feminism and Postmodernism. *In:* NICHOLSON, I. B. L. (ed.) *Feminist Contentions. A Philosophical Exchange.* London and New York: Routledge.

BENSCHOP, Y. & DOOREWAARD, H. 1998. Covered by equality: the gender subtext of organizations. *Organization Studies,* 19 (5)**,** 787-805.

BENSCHOP, Y. & DOOREWAARD, H. 2012. Gender subtext revisited. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal,* 31 (3)**,** 225-235.

BENSCHOP, Y. & MEIHUIZEN, H. E. 2002. Keeping up gendered appearances: representations of gender in financial annual reports. *Accounting, Organizations and Society,* 27 (7)**,** 611-636.

BENSCHOP, Y. & VAN DEN BRINK, M. 2018. The godmother of gendered organizations: In celebration of the work of Joan Acker. *Gender, Work & Organization,* doi: 10.1111/gwao.12231.

BENSON, J. 1977. Organizations: A Dialectical View. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 22 (1)**,** 1-21.

BENZER, M. 2011. *The sociology of Theodor Adorno,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

BERGER, J. 2008. *Ways of seeing* Paris and London, BBC and Penguin Books.

BERGLUND, K., AHL, H., PETTERSSON, K. & TILLMAR, M. 2018. Women's entrepreneurship, neoliberalism and economic justice in the postfeminist era: A discourse analysis of policy change in Sweden. *Gender, Work & Organization,* 25 (5)**,** 531-556.

BETTCHER, T. 2013. Trans Women and the Meaning of "Woman". *In:* POWER, N., HALWANI, R. & SOBLE, A. (eds.) *The Philosophy of Sex. Contemporary Readings.* 6th ed. New York, Toronto, Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield.

BETTCHER, T. 2014. Trapped in the Wrong Theory: Rethinking Trans Oppression and Resistance. *Signs,* 39 (2)**,** 383-406.

BETTCHER, T. 2016. Intersexuality, Transgender and Transexuality *In:* HAWKESWORTH, M. & DISCH, L. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Feminist Theory.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

BEYES, T. 2017. Colour and organization studies. *Organization Studies,* 38 (10)**,** 1467–1482.

BEYES, T. & DE COCK, C. 2017. Adorno's grey, Taussig's blue: Colour, organization and critical affect. *Organization,* 24 (1)**,** 59-78.

BIELBY, W. & BARON, J. 1986. Men and Women at Work: Sex Segregation and Statistical Discrimination. *American Journal of Sociology,* 91 (4)**,** 759-799.

BÎGIOI, C. & BÎGIOI, A. 2017. The Principle of Diversity in Management. *FAIMA Business & Management Journal,* 5 (4)**,** 65-77.

BINARD, F. 2017. The British Women's Liberation Movement in the 1970s: Redefining the Personal and the Political. *Revue française de civilisation britannique,* XXII- Hors série (hors-série).

BINDEL, J. 2004. Gender benders, beware. *The Guardian*, January 31.

BLACKBURN, D. 2018. Reassessing Britain's 'Post-war consensus': the politics of reason 1945–1979. *British Politics,* 13 (2)**,** 195-214.

BLEIJENBERGH, I., BOOYSEN, L. & MILLS, A. J. 2018. The challenges and outcomes of critical diversity scholarship. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management,* 13 (3)**,** 206-217.

BLEIJENBERGH, I. & FIELDEN, S. 2015. Examining diversity in organizations from critical perspectives: the validity of the research process. *In:* BENDL, R., BLEIJENBERGH, I., HENTTONNEN, E. & MILLS, A. J. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Diversity in Organizations.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

BLOOM, A. 2017. No More Boys and Girls takes gender out the classroom. *Times Education Supplement*, p.2 October 2017.

BLOOR, M. & BLOOR, T. 2007. *The practice of critical discourse analysis : an introduction,* London, Hodder Education.

BÖHM, S. & BATTA, A. 2010. Just doing it: enjoying commodity fetishism with Lacan. *Organization,* 17 (3)**,** 345–361.

BØHREN, Ø. & STAUBO, S. 2016. Mandatory Gender Balance and Board Independence. *European Financial Management,* 22 (1)**,** 3-30.

BOULDING, E. 1976. Familial Constraints on Women's Work Roles. *Signs,* 1 (3)**,** 95-117.

BOVENS, L. & MARCOCI, A. 2018. Gender-neutral restrooms require new (choice) architecture. *BPP Blog* [Online]. Available from: https://bppblog.com/2018/04/17/gender-neutral-restrooms-require-new-choice-architecture/ [Accessed 23 November 2018.

BOWEN, G. 2009. Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal,* 9 (2)**,** 27-40.

BOWRING, M. 2004. Resistance Is *Not* Futile: Liberating Captain Janeway from the Masculine-Feminine Dualism of Leadership. *Gender, Work & Organization,* 11 (4)**,** 381-405.

BRAIDOTTI, R. 1994. *Nomadic Subjects. Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory,* New York, Columbia University Press.

BRAIDOTTI, R. 2003. Becoming Woman: or Sexual Difference Revisited. *Theory, Culture and Society,* 20 (3)**,** 43-64.

BRAUN, V. & CLARKE, V. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology,* 3 (2)**,** 77-101.

BRAYBON, G. & SUMMERFIELD, P. 1987. *Out of the Cage. Women's Experiences in two World Wars,* London, Routledge.

BREEZE, R. 2011. Critical discourse analysis and its critics. *Pragmatics,* 21 (4)**,** 493-525.

BREWIS, D. N. 2017. Social Justice 'Lite'? Using Emotion for Moral Reasoning in Diversity Practice. *Gender, Work & Organization,* 24 (5)**,** 519-532.

BREWIS, D. N. 2019. Duality and Fallibility in Practices of the Self: The 'inclusive subject' in diversity training. *Organization Studies,* 40 (1)**,** 93-114.

BROOKS, A. 1997. *Postfeminisms: feminism, cultural theory and cultural forms.,* London and New York, Routledge.

BROWN, S. 2017. There's Never Been a Better Time to Be A Woman? Gendered Discourses on the Route to the Boardroom. Unpublished PhD thesis: King's College London.

BRYMAN, A. & BELL, E. 2015. *Business research methods,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

BRYNIN, M. & PERALES, F. 2016. Gender Wage Inequality: The De-gendering of the Occupational Structure. *European Sociological Review,* 32 (1)**,** 162-174.

BUCK-MORSS, S. 1977. *The origin of negative dialectics: Theodor W. Adorno, Walter Benjamin and the Frankfurt Institute* New York, Free Press.

BURKITT, I. 1999. *Bodies of thought : embodiment, identity and modernity,* London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, Sage Publications Ltd.

BURTON, B. 2014. Neoliberalism and the Equality Act 2010: A Missed Opportunity for Gender Justice? *Industrial Law Journal,* 43 (2)**,** 122-148.

BUTLER, J. 1986. Sex and Gender in Simone de Beauvoir's Second Sex. *Yale French Studies,* 72**,** 35-49.

BUTLER, J. 1987a. *Subjects of desire : Hegelian reflections in twentieth-century France,* New York, Columbia University Press.

BUTLER, J. 1987b. Variations on Sex and Gender: Beauvoir, Wittig and Foucault. *In:* BENHABIB, S. & CORNELL, D. (eds.) *Feminism as critique: essays on the politics of gender in late-capitalist societies.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

BUTLER, J. 1988. Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory. *Theatre Journal,* 40 (4)**,** 519-531.

BUTLER, J. 1990a. *Gender trouble : feminism and the subversion of identity,* New York, Routledge.

BUTLER, J. 1990b. Performative Acts and Gender Construction: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory. *In:* CASE, S.-E. (ed.) *Performing feminisms : feminist critical theory and theatre.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

BUTLER, J. 1993. *Bodies that matter: on the discursive limits of "sex",* New York, Routledge.

BUTLER, J. 1995. Contingent Foundations: Feminism and the Question of "Postmodernism". *In:* NICHOLSON, I. B. L. (ed.) *Feminist Contentions. A Philosophical Exchange.* New York; London: Routledge.

BUTLER, J. 2004. *Undoing gender,* New York, Routledge.

BUTLER, N., DELANEY, H. & SPOELSTRA, S. 2018. Risky business: Reflections on critical performativity in practice. *Organization,* 25 (3)**,** 428–445.

BUTLER, N. & SPOELSTRA, S. 2014. The Regime of Excellence and the Erosion of Ethos in Critical Management Studies. *British Journal of Management,* 25 (3)**,** 538-550.

CABANTOUS, L., GOND, J.-P., HARDING, N. & LEARMONTH, M. 2016. Critical Essay: Reconsidering critical performativity. *Human Relations,* 69 (2)**,** 197-213.

CAHUSAC, E. & KANJI, S. 2014. Giving Up: How Gendered Organizational Cultures Push Mothers Out. *Gender, Work & Organization,* 21 (1)**,** 57-70.

CALÁS, M., MORGAN, G. & SMIRCICH, L. 1992. Afterward/After Words: Open(ing?) Spaces. *Academy of Management Review,* 17 (3)**,** 607-611.

CALÁS, M. & SMIRCICH, L. 1996. From 'The Woman's' Point of View: Feminist Approaches to Organization Studies. *In:* CLEGG, S., HARDY, C. & NORD, W. (eds.) *Handbook of Organization Studies.* London; Thousand Oaks; New Delhi: SAGE publications.

CALÁS, M. & SMIRCICH, L. 1999. Past Postmodernism? Reflections and Tentative Directions. *Academy of Management Review,* 24 (4)**,** 649-671.

CALÁS, M. & SMIRCICH, L. 2006. From the "Women's Point of View" Ten Years Later: Towards a Feminist Organization Studies. *In:* CLEGG, S., HARDY, C., LAWRENCE, T. & NORD, W. (eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Organization Studies.* 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

CALÁS, M. & SMIRCICH, L. 2014. Engendering the Organizational: Feminist Theorizing and Organizational Studies. *In:* ADLER, P., DU GAY, P., MORGAN, G. & REED, M. (eds.) *Oxford Handbook of Sociology, Social Theory and Organization Studies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

CALÁS, M., SMIRCICH, L. & HOLVINO, E. 2014. Theorizing Gender-and-Organization. Changing Times .... Changing Theories? *In:* KUMRA, S., SIMPSON, R. & BURKE, R. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Gender In Organizations.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

CAMPBELL, K. & MINGUEZ VERA, A. 2010. Female board appointments and firm valuation: short and long-term effects. *Journal of Management & Governance,* 14 (1)**,** 37-59.

CANADAY, M. 2003. Promising Alliances: The Critical Feminist Theory of Nancy Fraser and Seyla Benhabib. *Feminist Review,* 74**,** 50-69.

CAPUTI, M. 2013. *Feminism and power : the need for critical theory,* Lanham, Maryland Lexington Books.

CAROTHERS, B. & REIS, H. 2013. Men and Women Are From Earth: Examining the Latent Structure of Gender. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 104 (2)**,** 385-407.

CARR, A. 2000. Critical theory and the management of change in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Change Management,* 13 (3)**,** 208-220.

CARR, A. 2003. Art as a Form of Knowledge: The Implications for Critical Management. *In:* CARR, A. & HANCOCK, P. (eds.) *Art and Aesthetics as a Way of Knowing Organization.* Hampshire, New York: PALGRAVE MACMILLAN.

CENTRICA PLC. 2014. *Balancing work and family commitments* [Online]. Available: https://www.centrica.com/news/balancing-work-and-family-commitments [Accessed 5 June 2017].

CHA, Y. 2013. Overwork and the Persistence of Gender Segregation in Occupations. *Gender & Society,* 27 (2)**,** 158-184.

CHA, Y. & WEEDEN, K. A. 2014. Overwork and the Slow Convergence in the Gender Gap in Wages. *American Sociological Review,* 79 (3)**,** 457-484.

CHANGING PEOPLE. 2015. *Bella Vuillermoz – Inspirational woman!* [Online]. Available: http://www.changingpeople.co.uk/2015/bella-vuillermoz-inspirational-woman/ [Accessed 14 June 2017].

CHANNEL 4. 2018a. *Genderquake* [Online]. Available: https://www.channel4.com/programmes/genderquake [Accessed 23 November 2018].

CHANNEL 4. 2018b. *What makes a woman?* [Online]. Available: https://www.channel4.com/programmes/what-makes-a-woman [Accessed 23 November 2018].

CHARTERED MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE. 2017. *Mind the gender pay gap* [Online]. Available: https://www.managers.org.uk/~/media/Files/PDF/Infographics/5895-Gender-Pay-Gap-Infographics-v4.pdf [Accessed 19 June 2018].

CHARTERED MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE 2018. Female FTSE bosses earn £3m less than men, new gender pay gap study shows.

CHARTERED MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE. 2019. *#Balance for better: gender pay gap reporting and the high wire* [Online]. Available: https://www.managers.org.uk/insights/news/2019/march/balanceforbetter-gender-pay-gap-reporting-and-the-high-wire?sc_trk=follow%20hit,{86CB756B-AB02-44E6-995A-305C69252B29},gender+pay+gap [Accessed 2 August 2019].

CHODOROW, N. 1978. The reproduction of mothering : psychoanalysis and the sociology of gender Berkeley: University of California Press.

CHRISTENSEN, J. & MUHR, S. L. 2018. Desired diversity and symptomatic anxiety: theorising failed diversity as Lacanian lack. *Culture and Organization,* 24 (2)**,** 114-133.

COCA-COLA HBC AG 2016. Annual report.

COCKBURN, C. 1983. *Brothers : male dominance and technological change,* London, Pluto Press.

COCKBURN, C. 1985. *Machinery of dominance : women, men and technical know-how,* London, Pluto Press.

COHEN, L., HANCOCK, P. & TYLER, M. 2006. 'Beyond the Scope of the Possible': Art, Photography and Organisational Abjection. *Culture and Organization,* 12 (2)**,** 109–125.

CONCHITA. Undated. *Biography, Conchita* [Online]. Available: http://conchitawurst.com/about-us/ [Accessed 31 December 2018].

CONTU, A. 2018. '… The point is to change it' – Yes, but in what direction and how? Intellectual activism as a way of 'walking the talk' of critical work in business schools. *Organization,* 25 (2)**,** 282-293.

CONTU, A. 2019. Answering the crisis with intellectual activism: Making a difference as business schools scholars. *Human Relations***,** doi: 001872671982736.

CONTU, A. & WILLMOTT, H. 2006. Studying Practice: Situating *Talking About Machines. Organization Studies,* 27 (12)**,** 1769-1782.

COOK, D. 2006. Adorno's critical materialism. *Philosophy & Social Criticism,* 32 (6)**,** 719-737.

COOK, D. 2008. Theodor W. Adorno: an introduction. *In:* COOK, D. (ed.) *Theodor Adorno : key concepts.* London and New York: Routledge.

COOK, D. 2010. The One and the Many: Revisioning Adorno's Critique of Western Reason. *Studies in Social and Political Thought,* 18**,** 115-125.

COOK, D. 2013. Adorno, Foucault and critique. *Philosophy & Social Criticism,* 39 (10)**,** 965-981.

COOK, D. 2014. Notes on Individuation in Adorno and Foucault. *Philosophy Today,* 58 (3)**,** 325-344.

COOK, D. 2015. "Is power always secondary to the economy?" Foucault and Adorno on Power and Exchange. *Foucault Studies,* 20**,** 180-198.

COOK, D. 2016. Adorno's critical materialism. *Philosophy & Social Criticism,* 32 (6)**,** 719-737.

COOPER, R. & BURRELL, G. 1988. Modernism, Postmodernism and Organizational Analysis: An Introduction. *Organization Studies,* 9 (1)**,** 91-112.

CORNELL, D. 1995. Rethinking the time of feminism. *In:* NICHOLSON, I. B. L. (ed.) *Feminist Contentions. A Philosophical Exchange.* New York and London: Routledge.

CORNELL, D. & THURSCHWELL, A. 1987. Feminism, Negativity, Intersubjectivity. *In:* BENHABIB, S. & CORNELL, D. (eds.) *Feminism as Critique. Essays on the Politics of Gender in Late-Capitalist Societies.* Oxford: Polity Press.

COSTA DIAS, M., ELMING, W. & JOYCE, R. 2016. The Gender Wage Gap.

COSTA DIAS, M., JOYCE, R. & PARODI, F. 2018. *Wage progression and the gender wage gap: the causal impact of hours of work* [Online]. Available: https://www.ifs.org.uk/publications/10358 [Accessed 30 November 2018].

COX, J. & MINAHAN, S. 2005. Organization, Decoration. *Organization,* 12 (4)**,** 529–548.

CRANFIELD UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT 2016. Female FTSE Board Report 2016. Women on boards, taking stock of where we are.

CRANFIELD UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT 2019. The Female FTSE Board Report 2019. Moving beyond the numbers.

CROMPTON, R. 1988. Occupational segregation. *The Social Change and Economic Life Initiative.* The Economic and Social Research Council.

CUKIER, W., GAGNON, S., ROACH, E., ELMI, M., YAP, M. & RODRIGUES, S. 2017. Trade-offs and disappearing acts: shifting societal discourses of diversity in Canada over three decades. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management,* 28 (7)**,** 1031-1064.

DAHANAYAKE, P., RAJENDRAN, D., SELVARAJAH, C. & BALLANTYNE, G. 2018. Justice and fairness in the workplace: a trajectory for managing diversity. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal,* 37 (5)**,** 470-490.

DARWIN, H. 2017. Doing Gender Beyond the Binary: A Virtual Ethnography. *Symbolic Interaction,* 40 (3)**,** 317-334.

DAVIES, M. 2011. Women on Boards.

DAVIES, M. 2015. Improving the Gender Balance on British Boards.

DE BEAUVOIR, S. 2011. *The Second Sex,* New York, Vintage.

DEACON, L. 2018. Khan's London City Hall Scraps Female Showers, Goes 'Gender Neutral'. *Breitbart*, 21 November

DELAMATER, J. & SHIBLEY HYDE, J. 1998. Essentialism vs. Social Constructionism in the Study of Human Sexuality. *The Journal of Sex Research,* 35 (1)**,** 10-18.

DELEUZE, G. & GUATTARI, F. 2003. *A thousand plateaus. Capitalism and schizophrenia,* London; New York, Continuum.

DENHAM, J. & SHEPHERD, J. 2017. Eurovision 2017: Most controversial acts of all-time, from Conchita Wurst to Israel waving Syrian flags. *The Independent*, May 12.

DENNISSEN, M., BENSCHOP, Y. & VAN DEN BRINK, M. 2018a. Diversity Networks: Networking for Equality? *British Journal of Management***,** doi: 10.1111/1467-8551.12321.

DENNISSEN, M., BENSCHOP, Y. & VAN DEN BRINK, M. 2018b. Rethinking Diversity Management: An Intersectional Analysis of Diversity Networks. *Organization Studies***,** doi: 10.1177/0170840618800103.

DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION 2019. Graduate Labour Market Statistics 2018.

DEVEAUX, M. 1994. Feminism and Empowerment: A Critical Reading of Foucault. *Feminist Studies,* 20 (2)**,** 223-247.

DEWS, P. 1986. Adorno Post-structuralism and the Critique of Identity. *New Left Review,* I/157 (May-June 1986)**,** 28-44.

DEWS, P. 1989. The Return of the Subject in late Foucault. *Radical Philosophy,* Spring**,** 37-41.

DIAGEO. 2017. *Smirnoff continues 'We're Open' campaign with new work to raise awareness of the trans and non-binary community* [Online]. Available: https://www.diageo.com/en/news-and-media/features/smirnoff-continues-we-re-open-campaign-with-new-work-to-raise-awareness-of-the-trans-and-non-binary-community/ [Accessed 6 July 2018].

DIAGEO. 2018a. *Diageo Colombia ranked fifth in the PAR: Ranking of Gender Equality in Organisations* [Online]. Available: https://www.diageo.com/en/news-and-media/features/diageo-colombia-ranked-fifth-in-the-par-ranking-of-gender-equality-in-organisations/ [Accessed 20 August 2018].

DIAGEO. 2018b. *Diageo included in Bloomberg Gender-Equality Index* [Online]. Available: https://www.diageo.com/en/news-and-media/features/diageo-included-in-bloomberg-gender-equality-index/ [Accessed 5 July 2018].

DIAGEO. Undated-a. *Diageo recognized for Diversity & Inclusion* [Online]. Available: https://www.diageo.com/en/news-and-media/features/our-work-on-diversity-and-inclusion-receives-double-recognition/ [Accessed 2 February 2017].

DIAGEO. Undated-b. *Inclusion and diversity* [Online]. Available: https://www.diageo.com/en/careers/working-at-diageo/inclusion-and-diversity/ [Accessed 10 August 2017].

DINEEN, M. 2011. *Friendly Remainders: Essays in Music Criticism After Adorno,* Canada, McGill-Queen's University Press.

DOBUSCH, L. 2014. How exclusive are inclusive organisations? *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal,* 33 (3)**,** 220-234.

DOWARD, J. 2018. Women's groups claim 'silencing' on transgender concerns. *The Observer*, October 14.

DUE BILLING, Y. & ALVESSON, M. 1989. Four Ways of Looking at Women and Leadership. *Scandinavian Journal of Management,* 5 (1)**,** 63-80.

DUFFY, K., HANCOCK, P. & TYLER, M. 2016. Still Red Hot? Postfeminism and Gender Subjectivity in the Airline Industry. *Gender, Work & Organization,* 24 (3)**,** 260-273.

DUFORD, R. 2017. Daughters of the Enlightenment: Reconstructing Adorno on Gender and Feminist Praxis. *Hypatia,* 32 (4)**,** 784-800.

DYE, K. & GOLNARAGHI, G. 2015. Organizational Benefits Through Diversity Management. *In:* BENDL, R., BLEIJENBERGH, I., HENTTONEN, E. & MILLS, A. J. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Diversity in Organizations.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

DZUBINSKI, L. & DIEHL, A. 2018. The problem of gender essentialism and its implications for women in leadership. *Journal of Leadership Studies,* 12 (1)**,** 56-61.

EAGAN, J. 2006. Unfreedom, Suffering, and the Culture Industry: What Adorno Can Contribute to a Feminist Ethics. *In:* HEBERLE, R. (ed.) *Feminist Interpretations of Theodor Adorno.* Pennsylvania The Pennsylvania State University.

EAGLY, A. & JOHNSON, B. 1990. Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin,* 108 (2)**,** 233-256.

EAGLY, A. H., JOHANNESEN-SCHMIDT, M. C. & VAN ENGEN, M. L. 2003. Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin,* 129 (4)**,** 569-591.

EDUCATION AND EMPLOYERS 2018a. Drawing The Future.

EDUCATION AND EMPLOYERS 2018b. Teenage apprenticeships. Converting awareness to recruitment.

EGAN, M. 2018. LGBTI staff, and diversity within the Australian accounting profession. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal,* 9 (5)**,** 595-614.

ELLIOTT, C. & STEAD, V. 2018. Constructing Women's Leadership Representation in the UK Press During a Time of Financial Crisis: Gender capitals and dialectical tensions. *Organization Studies,* 39 (1)**,** 19-45.

EMMISON, M. 2004. The conceptualization and analysis of visual data. *In:* SILVERMAN, D. (ed.) *Qualitative Research. Theory, Method and Practice.* Second ed. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.

EMMISON, M. 2011. Conceptualizing Visual Data. *In:* SILVERMAN, D. (ed.) *Qualitative Research. Issues of Theory, Method and Practice.* 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications Ltd.

ENGELS, F. 1972. *The origin of the family, private property and the state : in the light of the researches of Lewis H. Morgan,* London, Lawrence and Wishart.

ENGELS, F. 2001. The condition of the working class in England

EQUALITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION 2016. An inquiry into fairness, transparency and diversity in FTSE 350 board appointments.

EQUALITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION 2017. The Gender Pay Gap.

EQUALITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION. 2019. *What is the Equality Act?* [Online]. Available: https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/equality-act-2010/what-equality-act [Accessed 5 January 2020].

EUROFOUND. 2017. *Segregation* [Online]. Available: https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/observatories/eurwork/industrial-relations-dictionary/segregation [Accessed 22 October 2017].

FAIRCLOUGH, N. 1992. *Discourse and social change,* Cambridge, Polity Press.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. 2005. Discourse Analysis in Organization Studies: The Case for Critical Realism. *Organization Studies,* 26 (6)**,** 915-939.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. 2010. *Critical discourse analysis : the critical study of language,* Harlow, Longman.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. & WODAK, R. 1997. Critical Discourse Analysis. *In:* VAN DIJK, T. (ed.) *Discourse as Social Interaction.* London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.

FAUSTO-STERLING, A. 2005. The Bare Bones of Sex: Part 1 - Sex and Gender. *Signs,* 30 (2)**,** 1491-1527.

FAYE, S. 2018. Trans visibility is greater than ever – but that's a double-edged sword. *The Guardian*, March 30.

FEREDAY, J. & MUIR-COCHRANE, E. 2006. Demonstrating Rigor Using Thematic Analysis: A Hybrid Approach of Inductive and Deductive Coding and Theme Development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* 5 (1)**,** 80-92.

FERGUSON, E. 2018. *What's the deal with those gender-neutral toilets?* [Online]. Available: https://www.studenthut.com/articles/what%E2%80%99s-deal-those-gender-neutral-toilets [Accessed 25 November 2018].

FINANCIAL REPORTING COUNCIL 2016. The UK Corporate Governance Code.

FINLAYSON, J. G. 2014. Hegel, Adorno and the Origins of Immanent Criticism. *British Journal for the History of Philosophy,* 22 (6)**,** 1142-1166.

FIRESTONE, S. 1979. *The dialectic of sex : the case for feminist revolution* USA; Canada, William Morrow and Co.

FISHER, O. 2018. Fair and accurate media coverage really could improve the lives of transgender people like me. *The Independent*, February 19.

FLANDERS, C. E. 2017. Under the Bisexual Umbrella: Diversity of Identity and Experience. *Journal of Bisexuality,* 17 (1)**,** 1-6.

FLAX, J. 1987. Postmodernism and Gender Relations in Feminist Theory. *Signs,* 12 (4)**,** 621-643.

FLEMING, P. & BANERJEE, S. B. 2016. When performativity fails: Implications for Critical Management Studies. *Human Relations,* 69 (2)**,** 257-276.

FOUCAULT, M. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language,* New York, Pantheon Books.

FOUCAULT, M. 1978. *The History of Sexuality. Volume 1: An Introduction,* New York, Random House.

FOUCAULT, M. 1980. *Power/knowledge: selected interviews & other writings, 1972-1977,* New York, Pantheon Books.

FOUCAULT, M. 1982. The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry,* 8 (4)**,** 777-795.

FOUCAULT, M. 1984. Nietzsche, genealogy, history. *In:* RABINOW, P. (ed.) *The Foucault Reader.* New York: Pantheon.

FOUCAULT, M. 1988. Technologies of the self *In:* MARTIN, L., GUTMAN, H. & HUTTON, P. (eds.) *Technologies of the Self: a seminar with Michel Foucault* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

FOUCAULT, M. 1991a. Politics and the study of discourse. *In:* BURCHELL, G., GORDON, C. & MILLER, P. (eds.) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

FOUCAULT, M. 1991b. Questions of Method. *In:* BURCHELL, G., GORDON, C. & MILLER, P. (eds.) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

FOUCAULT, M. 1994. *Aesthetics, method and epistemology,* New York, New Press.

FOUCAULT, M. 1995. *Discipline and punish: the Birth of the Prison,* New York, Vintage Books.

FOUCAULT, M. 2000. Power. *In:* FAUBION, J. (ed.) *Essential works of Foucault, 1954-1984* London: Penguin.

FOURNIER, V. & GREY, C. 2000. At the critical moment: Conditions and prospects for critical management studies. *Human Relations,* 53 (1)**,** 7-32.

FOURNIER, V. & SMITH, W. 2006. Scripting masculinity. *Ephemera: Theory and Politics in Organization,* 6 (2)**,** 141-162.

FRASER, N. 1985. What's Critical about Critical Theory? The Case of Habermas and Gender. *New German Critique,* 35**,** 97-131.

FRASER, N. 1995. False Antitheses. *In:* NICHOLSON, I. B. L. (ed.) *Feminist Contentions. A Philosophical Exchange.* New York and London: Routledge.

FRASER, N. 2013. *Fortunes of Feminism. From State-Managed Capitalism to Neoliberal Crisis,* London and New York, Verso.

FRASER, N. & NICHOLSON, L. 1990. Social Criticism without Philosophy: An Encounter between Feminism and Postmodernism. *In:* NICHOLSON, L. (ed.) *Feminism/Postmodernism.* New York and London: Routledge.

FRESNILLO PLC 2016. Annual report 2016.

FROST, S. 2011. The Implications of the New Materialisms for Feminist Epistemology. *In:* GRASSWICK, H. (ed.) *Feminist Epistemology and Philosophy of Science: Power in Knowledge.* New York: Springer.

FULLER, A. & UNWIN, L. 2014. The challenges facing young women in apprenticeships. *In:* SCHOON, I. & ECCLES, J. (eds.) *Gender Differences in Aspirations and Attainment: A Life Course Perspective.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

FUSS, D. 1989. *Essentially speaking : feminism, nature & difference,* New York, Routledge.

GANDER, M. 2018. Let the right one in: A Bourdieusian analysis of gender inequality in universities' senior management. *Gender, Work & Organization,* 26 (2)**,** 107-123.

GANDESHA, S. 1991. The theatre of the "other": adorno, poststructuralism and the critique of identity. *Philosophy & Social Criticism,* 17 (3)**,** 243-263.

GANDESHA, S. 2006. The "Aesthetic Dignity of Words": Adorno's Philosophy of Language. *New German Critique,* 33 (1)**,** 137-158.

GANNON, S. & DAVIES, B. 2012. Postmodern, Poststructural, and Critical Theories. *In:* HESSE-BIBER, S. N. (ed.) *Handbook of feminist research : theory and praxis.* 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

GARRISON, S. 2018. On the Limits of "Trans Enough": Authenticating Trans Identity Narratives. *Gender & Society,* 32 (5)**,** 613-637.

GATENS, M. 2002. Feminism as "Password": Re-Thinking the "Possible" with Spinoza and Deleuze. *Hypatia,* 15 (2)**,** 59-75.

GATRELL, C. 2008. *Embodying women's work,* Maidenhead, Open University Press.

GHERARDI, S. 1994. The gender we think, the gender we do in our everday organizational lives. *Human Relations,* 47 (6)**,** 591-610.

GHERARDI, S. 2019. If we practice posthumanist research, do we need 'gender' any longer? *Gender, Work & Organization,* 26 (1)**,** 40-53.

GHEROVICI, P. 2017. *Transgender Psychoanalysis. A Lacanian Perspective on Sexual Difference,* London and New York, Routledge.

GHORASHI, H. & SABELIS, I. 2013. Juggling difference and sameness: Rethinking strategies for diversity in organizations. *Scandinavian Journal of Management,* 29 (1)**,** 78-86.

GILL, R. 2007. Postfeminist media culture. Elements of a sensibility. *European Journal of Cultural Studies,* 10 (2)**,** 147-166.

GILLIGAN, C. 2003. *In a different voice : psychological theory and women's development,* USA, Harvard University Press.

GIPSON, A., PFAFF, D., MENDELSOHN, D., CATENACCI, L. & BURKE, W. 2017. Women and Leadership: Selection, Development, Leadership Style, and Performance. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science,* 53 (1)**,** 32-65.

GKN PLC Undated. GKN Code, Doing the Right Thing.

GLENCORE PLC 2016. Annual report.

GODMAN, M. 2018. Gender as a historical kind: a tale of two genders? *Biology and Philosophy,* 33 (3)**,** 1-16.

GOV.UK. 2013a. *Better and simpler company reporting* [Online]. Available: https://www.gov.uk/government/news/better-and-simpler-company-reporting [Accessed 11 April 2017].

GOV.UK 2013b. The Companies Act 2006 (Strategic Report and Directors' Report) Regulations 2013.

GOV.UK. 2018. *Revealed: The worst explanations for not appointing women to FTSE company boards* [Online]. Available: https://www.gov.uk/government/news/revealed-the-worst-explanations-for-not-appointing-women-to-ftse-company-boards [Accessed 31 May 2018].

GOVERNMENT EQUALITIES OFFICE 2018a. Reform of the Gender Recognition Act – Government Consultation.

GOVERNMENT EQUALITIES OFFICE 2018b. Return to work: parental decision making.

GRAHAM, L. 2005. Discourse analysis and the critical use of Foucault. *Australian Assocation for Research in Education.* Sydney.

GRANT, D., IEDEMA, R. & OSWICK, C. 2009. Discourse and Critical Management Studies. *In:* ALVESSON, M., BRIDGMAN, T. & WILLMOTT, H. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

GRANT, J. 1988. Women as Managers: What They Can Offer to Organizations. *Organizational Dynamics,* 16 (3)**,** 56-63.

GRANTER, E. 2014. Critical theory and Organization Studies. *In:* ADLER, P., DU GAY, P., MORGAN, G. & REED, M. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Sociology, Social Theory and Organization Studies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

GRAY, D. 2018. *Doing Research in the Real World,* Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Sage.

GRAY, J. 2002. *Men are from Mars, women are from Venus: the definitive guide to relationships* London, Element.

GREGORY-SMITH, I., MAIN, B. & O'REILLY, C. 2014. Appointments, Pay and Performance in UK Boardrooms by Gender. *The Economic Journal,* 124 (February)**,** F109-F128.

GREMMEN, I. & BENSCHOP, Y. 2011. Negotiating Ambivalence: The Leadership of Professional Women's Networks. *In:* WERHANE, P. & PAINTER-MORLAND, M. (eds.) *Leadership, Gender and Organization.* New York Springer.

GRIMSHAW, D. & RUBERY, J. 2007. Undervaluing women's work. *In:* EUROPEAN WORK AND EMPLOYMENT RESEARCH CENTRE (ed.). University of Manchester.

GROSZ, E. 2006. Bergson, Deleuze and the Becoming of Unbecoming. *Parallax,* 11 (2)**,** 4-13.

GROSZ, E. 2008. Darwin and feminism: preliminary investigations for a possible alliance. *In:* ALAIMO, S. & HEKMAN, S. J. (eds.) *Material Feminisms.* Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

GUARDIAN. 2016. *Unilever vows to drop sexist stereotypes from its ads* [Online]. Available: https://www.theguardian.com/media/2016/jun/22/unilever-sexist-stereotypes-ads-sunsilk-dove-lynx [Accessed 6 March 2017].

HAKIM, C. 1996. *Key issues in women's work : female heterogeneity and the polarisation of women's employment,* London, Athlone.

HAKIM, C. 2000. *Work-lifestyle choices in the 21st Century : preference theory,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

HALPERIN, D. M. 1995. Saint Foucault : towards a gay hagiography New York: Oxford University Press.

HAMILTON, M. 2013. "Difference and Expression: Adorno and Deleuze". *Western Political Science Association.* Los Angeles, California.

HAMMERSON PLC 2016. Annual report.

HAMPTON-ALEXANDER REVIEW 2016. FTSE Women Leaders, Improving gender balance in FTSE leadership.

HARDING, S. 1986. The Instability of the Analytical Categories of Feminist Theory. *Signs,* 11 (6)**,** 645-664.

HARDY, C. & THOMAS, R. 2015. Discourse in a Material World. *Journal of Management Studies,* 52 (5)**,** 680-696.

HARTMANN, H. 1976. Capitalism, Patriarchy, and Job Segregation by Sex. *Signs,* 1 (3)**,** 137-169.

HARTMANN, H. 1979. The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union. *Capital & Class,* 3 (2)**,** 1-33.

HARTMANN, H. & MARKUSEN, A. 1980. Contemporary Marxist Theory and Practice: A Feminist Critique. *The Review of Radical Political Economics,* 12 (2)**,** 87-94.

HARTMANN, R. 2014. Subversive functionalism: For a less canonical critique in critical management studies. *Human Relations,* 67 (5)**,** 611–632.

HARTSOCK, N. 1990. Foucault on Power; A Theory for Women? *In:* NICHOLSON, L. (ed.) *Feminism/Postmodernism.* New York and London: Routledge.

HATTENSTONE, S. 2018. Janet Mock: 'I'd never seen a young trans woman who was thriving in the world – I was looking for that'. *The Guardian*, April 15.

HAWKESWORTH, M. 2006. Gender and the 'Public': A Theoretical Overview. *20th Congress of the International Political Science Association*.

HEARN, J., HOLGERSSON, C. & JYRKINEN, M. 2016. Sexualities and/in 'Critical' Management Studies. *In:* PRASAD, J., PRASAD, P., MILLS, A. J. & MILLS, J.

(eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Critical Management Studies.* London and New York: Routledge.

HEBERLE, R. 1996. *The politics of experience : constructing a nonidentitarian feminism for theory and practice.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.

HEGEL, G. W. F. 1977. *Phenomenology of spirit,* Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press.

HEILMAN, M., E. 2001. Description and Prescription: How Gender Stereotypes Prevent Women's Ascent Up the Organizational Ladder. *Journal of Social Issues,* 57 (4)**,** 657-674.

HEKMAN, S. J. 1992. Reconstituting the Subject: Feminism, Modernism, and Postmodernism. *Hypatia,* 6 (2)**,** 44-63.

HELD, D. 1980. *Introduction to critical theory : Horkheimer to Habermas,* London, Hutchinson.

HERES, L. & BENSCHOP, Y. 2010. Taming diversity: an exploratory study on the travel of a management fashion. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal,* 29 (5)**,** 436-457.

HERZOG, B. 2016. Discourse analysis as immanent critique: Possibilities and limits of normative critique in empirical discourse studies. *Discourse & Society,* 27 (3)**,** 278-292.

HESSE-BIBER, S. N. & PIATELLI, D. 2007. Holistic Reflexivity. The Feminist Practice of Reflexivity. *In:* HESSE-BIBER, S. N. (ed.) *The Handbook of Feminist Research. Theory and Practice.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

HEWITT, A. 2006. A Feminine Dialectic of Enlightenment? Horkheimer and Adorno Revisited. *In:* HEBERLE, R. (ed.) *Feminist Interpretations of Theodor Adorno.* Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

HIGGS, E. 1987. Women, Occupations and Work in the Nineteenth Century Censuses. *History Workshop Journal,* 23 (Spring)**,** 59-80.

HIGGS, E. & WILKINSON, A. 2016. Women, Occupations and Work in the Victorian Censuses Revisited. *History Workshop Journal,* 81 (Spring)**,** 17-38.

HOEDEMAEKERS, C. 2010. 'Not even semblance': exploring the interruption of identification with Lacan. *Organization,* 17 (3)**,** 379-393.

HOHENDAHL, P. 1997. Adorno: The Discourse of Philosophy and the Problem of Language. *In:* PENSKY, M. (ed.) *The Actuality of Adorno. Critical Essays on Adorno and the Postmodern.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

HOLCK, L., MUHR, S. L. & VILLESÈCHE, F. 2016. Identity, diversity and diversity management: on theoretical connections, assumptions and implications for practice. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal,* 35 (1)**,** 48-64.

HOLLOWAY, J., MATAMOROS, F. & TISCHLER, S. 2009. Negativity & Revolution: Adorno and Political Activism. *In:* HOLLOWAY, J., MATAMOROS, F. & TISCHLER, S. (eds.) *Negativity & Revolution. Adorno and Political Activism.* London: Pluto Press.

HOLMES, J. 2005. Power and Discourse at Work: Is Gender Relevant? *In:* LAZAR, M. M. (ed.) *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis.* Basingstoke, Hampshire: PALGRAVE MACMILLAN.

HOOBLER, J. M., MASTERSON, C. R., NKOMO, S. M. & MICHEL, E. J. 2018. The Business Case for Women Leaders: Meta-Analysis, Research Critique, and Path Forward. *Journal of Management,* 44 (6)**,** 2473-2499.

HOOF, F. & BOELL, S. 2019. Culture, technology, and process in 'media theories': Toward a shift in the understanding of media in organizational research. *Organization,* (Special Issue: digital media)**,** doi: 10.1177/1350508419855702.

HOOK, D. 2005. Genealogy, discourse, 'effective history': Foucault and the work of critique. *Qualitative Research in Psychology,* 2 (1)**,** 3-31.

HOOKS, B. 2014. *Ain't I a Woman. Black Women and Feminism,* New York, Routledge.

HORKHEIMER, M. 2002. *Critical Theory. Selected Essays,* New York Continuum.

HORKHEIMER, M. 2004. *Eclipse of reason* London Continuum.

HORKHEIMER, M. & ADORNO, T. W. 2002. *Dialectic of enlightenment,* Stanford, California, Stanford University Press.

HOUSE OF COMMONS LIBRARY 2017. Women and the economy.

HOUSE OF COMMONS LIBRARY 2018a. The Gender Pay Gap.

HOUSE OF COMMONS LIBRARY 2018b. Women and the economy.

HOUSE OF COMMONS LIBRARY 2019. Women and the Economy.

HOWIE, G. 2006. The Economy of the Same: Identity, Equivalence and Exploitation. *In:* HEBERLE, R. (ed.) *Feminist Interpretations of Theodor Adorno.* Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University.

HUFFINGTON POST. 2016. *Unilever CEO Paul Polman: Gender Equality Can Transform Our Economy* [Online]. Available: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/paul-polman-talk-to-me_us_573b5513e4b0aee7b8e7e84a?utm_hp_ref=career--money [Accessed 6 March 2017].

HULLOT-KENTOR, R. 2006. *Introduction to T.W. Adorno's "The Idea of Natural-History",* New York, Columbia University Press.

HUMBERT, A. L., KELAN, E. & BRINK, M. 2018. The Perils of Gender Beliefs for Men Leaders as Change Agents for Gender Equality. *European Management Review***,** doi: 10.1111/emre.12325.

HURD, F. & DYER, S. 2012. Legislation and Voluntarism: Two Approaches to Achieving Equal Employment Opportunity Outcomes for Women in New Zealand. *In:* GRÖSCHL, S. & TAKAGI, J. (eds.) *Diversity Quotas, Diverse Perspectives, The Case of Gender.* Great Britain: Gower.

HUTTON, P. 2018. *Siemens unveils diversity pedestrian traffic signals for The Manchester Pride Festival* [Online]. Available: https://its-uk.org.uk/siemens-unveils-diversity-pedestrian-traffic-signals-for-the-manchester-pride-festival/ [Accessed 23 November 2018].

HYDE, J. 2005. The gender similarities hypothesis. *American Psychologist,* 60 (6)**,** 581-592.

IMDB. 2018a. *Butterfly* [Online]. Available: https://www.imdb.com/title/tt7703440/ [Accessed 23 November 2018].

IMDB. 2018b. *Transparent* [Online]. Available: https://www.imdb.com/title/tt3502262/ [Accessed 23 November 2018].

INMARSAT PLC 2019. Gender Pay Gap Report.

INSTITUTE FOR EMPLOYMENT STUDIES. undated. *Report summary: Women in the Labour Market, Two Decades of Change and Continuity* [Online]. Available: http://www.employment-studies.co.uk/report-summary-women-labour-market-two-decades-change-and-continuity [Accessed 29 March 2016].

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND. 2018. *The Helen Alexander Lecture: The Case for the Sustainable Development Goals* [Online]. Available:

https://www.imf.org/en/News/Articles/2018/09/17/sp09172018-the-case-for-the-sustainable-development-goals [Accessed 11 March 2019].

IRIGARAY, L. 1985. *Speculum of the other woman,* United States of America, Cornell University Press.

JACKMAN, J. 2017. Miley Cyrus: 'I'm gender-neutral'. *The Pink News*, May 5.

JACOBS, J. A. 1989. *Revolving Doors: Sex Segregation and Women's Careers,* Stanford, Stanford University Press.

JÄGER, S. & MAIER, F. 2009. Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of Foucauldian Critical Discourse Analysis and Dispositive Analysis. *In:* WODAK, R. & MEYER, M. (eds.) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.* Los Angeles, London, New Delhi: Sage.

JANCSARY, D., HÖLLERER, M. & MEYER, R. 2016. Critical analysis of visual and multimodal texts. *In:* WODAK, R. & MEYER, M. (eds.) *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies.* London; Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications Ltd.

JARVIS, S. 1998. *Adorno : a critical introduction,* Cambridge, Polity.

JAY, M. 1973. *The Dialectical Imagination,* London, Heinemann.

JOHANSSON, M. & RINGBLOM, L. 2017. The Business Case of Gender Equality in Swedish Forestry and Mining - Restricting or Enabling Organizational Change. *Gender, Work & Organization,* 24 (6)**,** 628-642.

JOHNS, N. R. & GREEN, A. J. 2009. Equality, equal opportunities and diversity: Obfuscation as social justice. *Equal Opportunities International,* 28 (4)**,** 289-303.

JOINT COUNCIL FOR QUALIFICATIONS 2018a. GCE entry, gender & regional charts - summer 2018.

JOINT COUNCIL FOR QUALIFICATIONS 2018b. GCSE additional charts - summer 2018

JONES, C., SVEJENOVA, S., PEDERSEN, J. & TOWNLEY, B. 2016. Misfits, Mavericks and Mainstreams: Drivers of Innovation in the Creative Industries. *Organization,* 37 (6)**,** 751–768.

JONES, T. 2018. Intersex Studies: A Systematic Review of International Health Literature. *SAGE Open,* 8 (2).

JONSEN, K., POINT, S., KELAN, E. & GRIEBLE, A. 2019. Diversity and inclusion branding: a five-country comparison of corporate websites. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management***,** doi: 10.1080/09585192.2018.1496125.

KALEV, A., KELLY, E. & DOBBIN, F. 2006. Best Practices or Best Guesses? Assessing the Efficacy of Corporate Affirmative Action and Diversity Policies. *American Sociological Review,* 71 (4)**,** 589-617.

KALLEBERG, A. 2009. Precarious Work, Insecure Workers: Employment Relations in Transition. *American Sociological Review,* 74 (1)**,** 1-22.

KANTER, R. 1977a. *Men and Women of the Corporation,* New York, Basic Books.

KANTER, R. 1977b. Some Effects of Proportions on Group Life: Skewed Sex Ratios and Responses to Token Women. *The American Journal of Sociology,* 82 (5)**,** 965-990.

KAVANAGH, D., KUHLING, C. & KEOHANE, K. 2005. The Odyssey of Instrumental Rationality: Confronting the Englightenment's Interior Other. *In:* LINSTEAD, S. & LINSTEAD, A. (eds.) *Thinking Organisation.* London: Routledge.

KELAN, E. 2008. The Discursive Construction of Gender in Contemporary Management Literature. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 81 (2)**,** 427-445.

KELLNER, D. 1989. *Critical Theory, Marxism and Modernity,* Cambridge, Polity Press.

KELLY, M. 2013. Foucault, Subjectivity and Technologies of the Self. *In:* FALZON, C., O'LEARY, T. & SAWICKI, J. (eds.) *A Companion to Foucault.* Maldon: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

KELLY, S. 2014. Towards a negative ontology of leadership. *Human Relations,* 67 (8), 905-922.

KENT SMITH, E. 2018. Gender neutral toilets across BBC: The Corporation puts in unisex loos and will soon give staff paid time off for sex change surgery. *Daily Mail* June 14.

KENTISH, B. 2018. Transgender people can continue to be denied access to some women-only spaces, government says. *The Independent*, June 24.

KERSTEN, A. 2000. Diversity management: Dialogue, dialectics and diversion. *Journal of Organizational Change Management,* 13 (3), 235-248.

KING, A. 2004. The Prisoner of Gender: Foucault and the Disciplining of the Female Body. *Journal of International Women's Studies,* 5 (2), 28-39.

KING, H. 2016. *The One-Sex Body on Trial: The Classical and Early Modern Evidence,* New York, Routledge.

KIRTON, G. & GREENE, A.-M. 2010. *The dynamics of managing diversity. A critical approach,* Oxford, Elsevier Ltd.

KLIKAUER, T. 2015. Critical management studies and critical theory: A review. *Capital & Class,* 39 (2), 197-220.

KNAPP, G. 1999. Fragile Foundations, Strong Traditions, Situated Questioning: Critical Theory in German-speaking Feminism. *In:* O'NEILL, M. (ed.) *Adorno, Culture and Feminism.* London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.

KNIGHTS, D. & CLARKE, C. 2017. Pushing the Boundaries of Amnesia and Myopia: A Critical Review of the Literature on Identity at Work in Management and Organization Studies. *International Journal of Management Reviews,* 19 (3), 337-356.

KNIGHTS, D. & KERFOOT, D. 2004. Between Representations and Subjectivity: Gender Binaries and the Politics of Organizational Transformation. *Gender, Work & Organization,* 11 (4), 431-454.

KNIGHTS, D., PULLEN, A. & RHODES, C. 2015. Binaries need to shatter for bodies to matter: Do disembodied masculinities undermine organizational ethics? *Organization,* 22 (2), 200-216.

KNIGHTS, D. & TULLBERG, M. 2011. Managing masculinity/mismanaging the corporation. *Organization,* 19 (4), 385-404.

KÖLLEN, T., KAKKURI-KNUUTTILA, M.-L. & BENDL, R. 2018. An indisputable "holy trinity"? On the moral value of equality, diversity, and inclusion. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal,* 37 (5), 438-449.

KORCZYNSKI, M. & OTT, U. 2016. The Menu in Society: Mediating Structures of Power and Enchanting Myths of Individual Sovereignty. *Sociology,* 40 (5), 911-928.

KOSKINEN SANDBERG, P. 2017. Intertwining Gender Inequalities and Gender-neutral Legitimacy in Job Evaluation and Performance-related Pay. *Gender, Work & Organization,* 24 (2), 156-170.

KOSKINEN SANDBERG, P. & SAARI, M. 2018. Sisters (can't) unite! Wages as macro-political and the gendered power orders of corporatism. *Gender, Work & Organization,* 26 (5), 633-649.

KRESS, G. 2012. Multimodal discourse analysis. *In:* GEE, J. & HANDFORD, M. (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis.* London and New York: Routledge.

KRUKS, S. 1992. Gender and Subjectivity: Simone de Beauvoir and Contemporary Feminism. *Signs,* 18 (1)**,** 89-110.

KUMRA, S., LEWIS, P., RUMENS, N. & SIMPSON, R. 2019. Towards a Performative Understanding of Deservingness: Merit, Gender and the BBC Pay Dispute. *Gender, Work & Organization***,** doi: 10.1111/gwao.12397.

LAQUEUR, T. W. 1990. *Making Sex. Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud,* Cambridge, Massachusetts; London, England, Harvard University Press.

LARSEN, G. 2017. 'It's a man's man's man's world': Music groupies and the othering of women in the world of rock. *Organization,* 24 (3)**,** 397-417.

LAZAR, M. M. 2005. Politicizing Gender in Discourse: Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis as Political Perspective and Praxis. *In:* LAZAR, M. M. (ed.) *Feminist critical discourse analysis : gender, power, and ideology in discourse.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

LAZAR, M. M. 2007. Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Articulating a Feminist Discourse Praxis. *Critical Discourse Studies,* 4 (2)**,** 141-164.

LAZAR, M. M. 2018. Feminist critical discourse analysis. *In:* FLOWERDUE, J. A. R., J (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies.* London; New York: Routledge.

LAZARD, L., MCAVOY, J. & CAPDEVILA, R. 2016. Postmodern feminist psychology. *In:* NAPLES, N., HOOGLAND, R., WICKRAMASINGHE, M. & WONG, W. (eds.) *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Gender and Sexuality Studies.* Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.

LEACOCK, E. B. 1981. *Myths of male dominance : collected articles on women cross-culturally,* New York, Monthly Review Press.

LEEB, C. 2008. Toward a Theoretical Outline of the Subject: The Centrality of Adorno and Lacan for Feminist Political Theorizing. *Political Theory,* 36 (3)**,** 351-376.

LEGISLATION.GOV.UK 2010. Equality Act.

LERNER, G. 1986. *The creation of patriarchy,* New York, Oxford University Press.

LEWIS, J. 1988. Women Clerical Workers in the Late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries. *In:* ANDERSON, G. (ed.) *The White-Blouse Revolution: female office workers since 1870* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

LEWIS, P., BENSCHOP, Y. & SIMPSON, R. 2017. Postfeminism, Gender and Organization. *Gender, Work & Organization,* 24 (3)**,** 213-225.

LINSTEAD, A. & BREWIS, J. 2004. Editorial: Beyond Boundaries: Towards Fluidity in Theorizing and Practice. *Gender, Work & Organization,* 11 (4)**,** 355-362.

LINSTEAD, S. & PULLEN, A. 2006. Gender as multiplicity: Desire, displacement, difference and dispersion. *Human Relations,* 59 (9)**,** 1287-1310.

LITVIN, D. 1997. The discourse of diversity: from biology to management. *Organization,* 4**,** 187-209.

LONDON STOCK EXCHANGE. Undated. *FTSE* [Online]. Available: https://www.londonstockexchange.com/traders-and-brokers/private-investors/private-investors/stock-markets/ftse/ftse.htm [Accessed 19 January 2019].

LÓPEZ, S. 1999. The Encoding of History: Thinking Art in Constellations. *In:* O'NEILL, M. (ed.) *Adorno, Culture and Feminism.* London; Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE publications.

LORBER, J. 2011. Men as Women and Women as Men: Disrupting Gender. *In:* KIMMEL, M. & ARONSON, A. (eds.) *The Gendered Society Reader.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LORBIECKI, A. & JACK, G. 2000. Critical turns in the evolution of diversity management. *British Journal of Management,* 11 (3)**,** 17-31.

LÜCKERATH-ROVERS, M. 2013. Women on boards and firm performance. *Journal of Management & Governance,* 17 (2)**,** 491-509.

LYONETTE, C. & CROMPTON, R. 2014. Sharing the load? Partners' relative earnings and the division of domestic labour. *Work, Employment & Society,* 29 (1)**,** 23-40.

M&S 2016. Annual Report 2016.

M&S. 2017. *Gender equality - time for a change* [Online]. Available: https://corporate.marksandspencer.com/stories/blog/gender_equality_time_for_change [Accessed 22 March 2017].

MACCANNELL, J. 1999. Adorno: The Riddle of Femininity. *In:* O'NEILL, M. (ed.) *Adorno, Culture and Feminism.* London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.

MACHIN, D. & MAYR, A. 2012. *How to Do Critical Discourse Analysis: A Multimodal Introduction,* Los Angeles; London, Sage.

MACKINNON, C. A. 1989. *Toward a feminist theory of the state,* Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

MACPHERSON, A. 2015. Gender fluidity went pop in 2015 – and it's not just a phase. *The Guardian*, December 28.

MAGEE, B. 1987. *The Great Philosophers: An Introduction to Western Philosophy,* Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press.

MAIER, C. D. & RAVAZZANI, S. 2018. Framing Diversity in Corporate Digital Contexts: A Multimodal Approach to Discursive Recontextualizations of Social Practices. *International Journal of Business Communication***,** doi: 10.1177/2329488418768690.

MAIL ON SUNDAY. 2018. *'The young, lazy? Nonsense - just look at all the DIY videos on YouTube': The French boss transforming B&Q debunks a retail myth* [Online]. Available: http://www.thisismoney.co.uk/money/news/article-5929107/The-French-boss-transforming-B-Q-debunks-retail-myth.html [Accessed 11 July 2018].

MANAGEMENT TODAY. 2016. *Moya Greene, Royal Mail: 'Women need to take the risky roles'* [Online]. Available: http://www.managementtoday.co.uk/moya-greene-royal-mail-women-need-risky-roles/women-in-business/article/1412956 [Accessed 4 May 2017].

MARGOLIS, E. & PAUWELS, L. (eds.) 2011. *The SAGE handbook of visual research methods,* Los Angeles, London: Sage.

MARSHALL, J. 1993a. Organisational Cultures and Women Managers: Exploring the Dynamics of Resilience. *Applied Psychology: An International Review,* 42 (4)**,** 313-322.

MARSHALL, J. 1993b. Patterns of Cultural Awareness: Coping Strategies for Women Managers. *In:* LONG, B. & KAHN, S. (eds.) *Women, Work and Coping. A Multidisciplinary Approach to Workplace Stress.* Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.

MARSHALL, J. 1995. Gender and Management: A Critical Review of Research. *British Journal of Management,* 6 (Special issue)**,** 56-62.

MARTIN, B. 1987. Merit and Power. *Australian Journal of Social Issues,* 22 (2)**,** 436-451.

MARX, K. 1978. The Materialist Conception of History. *In:* BOTTOMORE, T. & RUBEL, M. (eds.) *Karl Marx: Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

MARX, K. & ENGELS, F. 1977. The Communist Manifesto. *In:* MCLELLAN, D. (ed.) *Karl Marx, Selected Writings.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MASCARETTI, G. 2017. *Adorno, Foucault, and the History of the Present.* Doctor of Philosophy, University of Essex.

MASON, J. 2018. *Qualitative researching* London; Thousand Oaks, California, Sage.

MAUTNER, G. 2009. Checks and Balances: How Corpus Linguistics can Contribute to CDA. *In:* WODAK, R. & MEYER, M. (eds.) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.* Los Angeles, London, New Delhi: Sage.

MAYOR OF LONDON 2017a. The London Plan.

MAYOR OF LONDON. 2017b. *Mayor publishes most pro-LGBT+ London Plan yet* [Online]. Available: https://www.london.gov.uk/press-releases/mayoral/mayor-publishes-most-pro-lgbt-london-plan-yet [Accessed 25 November 2018].

MCCARTHY, T. 1990. The Critique of Impure Reason: Foucault and the Frankfurt School. *Political Theory,* 18 (3)**,** 437-469.

MCDONALD, J. 2016. Occupational Segregation Research: Queering the Conversation. *Gender, Work & Organization,* 23 (1)**,** 19-35.

MCKINNON, R. 2014. Stereotype Threat and Attributional Ambiguity for Trans Women. *Hypatia,* 29 (4)**,** 857-872.

MEAKIN, L., HELLIER, D. & WARRE, H. 2019. *UK Financial Services Firms Fail to Improve Gender Pay Gap* [Online]. Available: https://www.insurancejournal.com/news/international/2019/04/05/522978.htm [Accessed 2 August 2019].

MEASE, J. & COLLINS, B. 2018. Asset, liability, possibility: Metaphors of human difference and the business case for diversity. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal,* 37 (7)**,** 664-682.

MEDICLINIC INTERNATIONAL PLC 2016. Code of Business Conduct and Ethics.

MENDES, K. 2012. 'Feminism rules! Now, where's my swimsuit?' Re-evaluating feminist discourse in print media 1968–2008. *Media, Culture & Society,* 34 (5)**,** 554-570.

MERILAINEN, S., TIENARI, J., KATILA, S. & BENSHOP, Y. 2009. Diversity Management Versus Gender Equality: The Finnish Case. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences,* 26**,** 230-243.

MERLIN ENTERTAINMENTS. Undated. *Welcome to Merlin Entertainments* [Online]. Available: http://www.merlinentertainments.biz/ [Accessed 16 February 2017].

METCALF, S. 2017. *Neoliberalism - Rise and fall of an idea that changed the world* [Online]. Available: https://www.theguardian.com/news/2017/aug/18/neoliberalism-the-idea-that-changed-the-world [Accessed 18 August 2017].

MILLS, A. J. 1988. Organization, Gender and Culture. *Organization Studies* 9(3)**,** 351-369.

MILLS, P. 1987. *Woman, Nature and Psyche,* New Haven and London, Yale University Press.

MINOU, C. 2010. Julie Bindel's dangerous transphobia. *The Guardian*, 1 February.

MIRANDÉ, A. 2016. Hombres Mujeres: An Indigenous Third Gender. *Man & Masculinities,* 19 (4)**,** 384-409.

MOHANTY, C. 1984. Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses. *Boundary 2,* 12/13 (Spring/Autumn)**,** 333-358.

MOI, T. 1999. *What is a woman?: and other essays,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

MOLT, A. 2002. Adorno and the Myth of Subjectivity. *Contretemps,* 3 (April 2002)**,** 109-121.

MORGAN, S. & CARRIER, H. 2014. The Transition from Education to Work: A Focus on Subject Choices. *In:* RAZZU, G. (ed.) *Gender Inequality in the Labour Market in the UK.* Oxford Oxford University Press.

MORGENROTH, T. & RYAN, M. K. 2018. Gender Trouble in Social Psychology: How Can Butler's Work Inform Experimental Social Psychologists' Conceptualization of Gender? *Frontiers in Psychology,* 9**,** 1-9.

MORROW, R. & BROWN, D. 1994. *Critical Theory and Methodology,* Thousand Oaks; London; New Delhi, Sage.

MUELLER, G. 1958. The Hegel Legend of "Thesis-Antithesis-Synthesis". *Journal of the History of Ideas,* 19 (3)**,** 411-414.

MUHR, S. L. 2011. Caught in the Gendered Machine: On the Masculine and Feminine in Cyborg Leadership. *Gender, Work & Organization,* 18 (3)**,** 337-357.

MUHR, S. L. & SULLIVAN, K. R. 2013. "None so queer as folk": Gendered expectations and transgressive bodies in leadership. *Leadership,* 9 (3)**,** 416-435.

MUMBY, D. & PUTNAM, L. 1992. The Politics of Emotion: A Feminist Reading of Bounded Rationality. *The Academy of Management Review,* 17 (3)**,** 465-486.

MURRAY, J. 2017. Be trans, be proud — but don't call yourself a "real woman". *The Sunday Times*, March 5.

MURRAY, K. & HUNTER BLACKBURN, L. 2019. Losing sight of women's rights: the unregulated introduction of gender self-identification as a case study of policy capture in Scotland. *Scottish Affairs,* 28 (3)**,** 262-289.

NÄGELE, R. 1982-1983. The Scene of the Other: Theodor W. Adorno's Negative Dialectic in the Context of Poststructuralism. *boundary 2,* 11 (1/2)**,** 59-79.

NEIMARK, M. & TINKER, T. 1987. Identity and Non-Identity thinking: Dialectical Critique of the Transaction Cost Theory of the Modern Corporation. *Journal of Management,* 13 (4)**,** 661-673.

NESBITT, N. 2005. The Expulsion of the Negative: Deleuze, Adorno, and the Ethics of Internal Difference. *SubStance,* 34 (2)**,** 75-97.

NICHOLSON, L. 1994. Interpreting Gender. *Signs,* 20 (1)**,** 79-105.

NKOMO, S. M. & RODRIGUEZ, J. K. 2018. Joan Acker's influence on Management and Organization Studies: Review, analysis and directions for the future. *Gender, Work & Organization,* Special Issue**,** doi: 10.1111/gwao.12237.

NOON, M. 2007. The fatal flaws of diversity and the business case for ethnic minorities. *Work, Employment & Society,* 21 (4)**,** 773-784.

O'BRIEN, M. 1979. Reproducing Marxist Man. *In:* CLARK, L. & LANGE, L. (eds.) *The Sexism of Social and Political Theory: Women and Reproduction from Plato to Nietzsche.* Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press.

O'BRIEN, M. 1981. *The politics of reproduction* Boston, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

O'CONNOR, B. 2013. *Adorno,* Abingdon, Routledge.

O'HAGAN, E. 2018. Back the Gender Recognition Act reform. It's the feminist thing to do. *The Guardian*, 19 October.

O'NEILL, M. 1999. Adorno and Women: Negative Dialectics, Kultrkritik and Unintentional Truth. *In:* O'NEILL, M. (ed.) *Adorno, Culture and Feminism.* London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publications

O'REGAN, J. P. 2006. The text as critical object: on theorising exegetic procedure in classroom-based critical discourse analysis. *Critical Discourse Studies,* 3 (2)**,** 179-209.

O'TOOLE, M. & GREY, C. 2016. 'We Can Tell Them to Get Lost, But We Won't Do That': Cultural Control and Resistance in Voluntary Work. *Organization Studies,* 37 (1)**,** 55-75.

OAKLEY, A. 1972. *Sex, gender and society,* London, Maurice Temple Smith Ltd.

OAKLEY, A. & MITCHELL, J. (eds.) 1997. *Who's afraid of feminism? : seeing through the backlash,* London: Hamish Hamilton.

OLD MUTUAL PLC Undated. Inclusion, Diversity and the Gender Pay Gap.

OMANOVIĆ, V. 2011. Diversity in Organizations: A Critical Examination of Assumptions about Diversity and Organizations in Twenty-first Century Management Literature. *In:* JEANES, E., KNIGHTS, D. & YANCEY MARTIN, P. (eds.) *Handbook of gender, work and organization.* Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

ONS 2013. Women in the labour market. Office for National Statistics.

ONS 2017. Graduates in the UK labour market 2017.

ONS. 2018a. *Contracts that do not guarantee a minimum number of hours* [Online]. Available: https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/earningsandworkinghours/articles/contractsthatdonotguaranteeaminimumnumberofhours/april2018 [Accessed 6 November 2018].

ONS. 2018b. *Employment by occupation* [Online]. Available: https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/employmentandemployeetypes/datasets/employmentbyoccupationemp04 [Accessed 30 November 2018].

ONS. 2018c. *Families and the labour market, England: 2018* [Online]. Available: https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/employmentandemployeetypes/articles/familiesandthelabourmarketengland/2018#how-did-mothers-employment-rates-change-when-considering-the-age-of-their-youngest-dependent-child [Accessed 29 October 2018].

ONS. 2018d. *Gender pay gap in the UK: 2018* [Online]. Available: https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/earningsandworkinghours/bulletins/genderpaygapintheuk/2018 [Accessed 1 January 2019].

ONS 2018e. Trends in self-employment in the UK.

ONS 2018f. UK labour market. October ed.: Office for National Statistics

ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT 2016. Time use for work, care and other day-to-day activities.

ORTNER, S. 1972. Is Female to Male as Nature Is to Culture? *Feminist Studies,* 1 (2 (Fall))**,** 5-31.

OSWICK, C. & NOON, M. 2014. Discourses of Diversity, Equality and Inclusion: Trenchant Formulations or Transient Fashions? *British Journal of Management,* 25 (1)**,** 23-39.

OVERALL, C. 2013. Trans Persons, Cisgender Persons, and Gender Identities. *In:* POWER, N., HALWANI, R. & SOBLE, A. (eds.) *The Philosophy of Sex. Contemporary Readings.* 6th ed. New York, Toronto, Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield.

OZBILGIN, M. & TATLI, A. 2011. Mapping out the field of equality and diversity: Rise of individualism and voluntarism. *Human Relations,* 64 (9)**,** 1229-1253.

PADDY POWER BETFAIR PLC 2016. Annual report

PARKER, M. 2001. Fucking Management: Queer, Theory and Reflexivity. *Ephemera: Theory and Politics,* 1 (1)**,** 36-53.

PARLIAMENT.UK. Undated. *Reforming society in the 19th century* [Online]. Available: http://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/transformingsociety/livinglearning/19thcentury/overview/laterfactoryleg/ [Accessed 13 October 2017].

PATEMAN, C. 1989. *The Disorder of Women: Democracy, Feminism and Political Theory,* Oxford, Polity Press.

PENSKY, M. 1997. Editor's Introduction: Adorno's Actuality. *In:* PENSKY, M. (ed.) *The Actuality of Adorno. Critical Essays on Adorno and the Postmodern.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

PENSKY, M. 2004. Natural History: the Life and Afterlife of a Concept in Adorno. *Critical Horizons* 5(1)**,** 227-258.

PERALES, F. 2013. Occupational sex-segregation, specialized human capital and wages: evidence from Britain. *Work, Employment & Society,* 27 (4)**,** 600-620.

PESONEN, S., TIENARI, J. & VANHALA, S. 2009. The boardroom gender paradox. *Gender in Management: An International Journal,* 24 (5)**,** 327-345.

PHILLIPS, A. & TAYLOR, B. 1980. Sex and Skill: Notes towards a Feminist Economics. *Feminist Review,* 6**,** 79-88.

POGGIO, B. 2006. Editorial: Outline of a Theory of Gender Practices. *Gender, Work & Organization,* 13 (3)**,** 225-233.

POLLACH, I. 2010. The Readership of Corporate Websites: A Cross-Cultural Study. *Journal of Business Communication,* 48 (1)**,** 27-53.

POSTER, M. 1982. Foucault and History. *Social Research,* 49 (1)**,** 116-142.

POWERS, P. 2007. The Philosophical Foundations of Foucaultian Discourse Analysis. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines,* 1 (2)**,** 18-34.

PRESTON, J. A. 1999. Occupational gender segregation: Trends and explanations. *Quarterly Journal of Economics and Finance,* 39**,** 611-624.

PRINGLE, J. & STRACHAN, G. 2015. Duelling Dualisms: A History of Diversity Management. *In:* BENDL, R., BLEIJENBERGH, I., HENTTONEN, E. & MILLS, A. J. (eds.) *The Oxford handbook of diversity in organizations.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

PRIOLA, V., LASIO, D., SERRI, F. & DE SIMONE, S. 2018. The organisation of sexuality and the sexuality of organisation: A genealogical analysis of sexual 'inclusive exclusion' at work. *Organization,* 25 (6)**,** 732-754.

PRUDENTIAL. 2018. *Gender pay gap follows women into retirement* [Online]. Available: https://www.pru.co.uk/press-centre/gender-pay-gap-follows-women-into-retirement/ [Accessed 23 November 2018].

PRÜGL, E. 2017. Neoliberalism with a Feminist Face: Crafting a new Hegemony at the World Bank. *Feminist Economics,* 23 (1)**,** 30-53.

PRUSIK, C. A. 2017. Economics as Natural-History: Adorno and the Critique of Neoliberalism. *Architecture and Culture,* 5 (2)**,** 165-174.

PULLEN, A. & RHODES, C. 2015. Is becoming-woman possible in organizations? *In:* PULLEN, A. & RHODES, C. (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Ethics, Politics and Organizations.* Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

PULLEN, A., RHODES, C. & THANEM, T. 2017. Affective politics in gendered organizations: Affirmative notes on becoming-woman. *Organization,* 24 (1)**,** 105-123.

REGAN-MEARS, R. 2018. *"Exciting News" - Bristol Uni to put in gender-neutral toilets* [Online]. Available: https://www.thestudentpocketguide.com/2018/09/trending/bristol-uni-gender-neutral-toilets/ [Accessed 23 November 2018].

REILLY-COOPER, R. 2016. Why self-identification shouldn't be the only thing that defines our gender. *The Conversation*, May 13.

RHODES, C. 2016. Re-membering the Other in organizations. *In:* MIR, R., WILLMOTT, H. & GREENWOOD, M. (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy in Organization Studies.* Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

RIACH, K. 2009. Exploring Participant-centred Reflexivity in the Research Interview. *Sociology,* 43 (2)**,** 356-370.

ROBERTS, A. 2014. The Political Economy of "Transnational Business Feminism". *International Feminist Journal of Politics,* 17 (2)**,** 209-231.

ROITHMAYR, D. 1997. Deconstructing the Distinction between Bias and Merit. *California Law Review,* 85 (5)**,** 1449-1507.

ROMANI, L., HOLCK, L. & RISBERG, A. 2019. Benevolent discrimination: Explaining how human resources professionals can be blind to the harm of diversity initiatives. *Organization,* 26 (3)**,** 371-390.

RONEN, S. 2018. The postfeminist ideology at work: Endorsing gender essentialism and denying feminine devaluation in the case of design work. *Gender, Work & Organization,* 25 (5)**,** 514-530.

ROSE, C. 2007. Does female board representation influence firm performance. *Corporate governance: an international review,* 15 (2)**,** 404-413.

ROSE, G. 1976. How is critical theory possible? Theodor W Adorno and concept formation in sociology. *Political Studies,* 24 (1)**,** 69-85.

ROSE, G. 2016. *Visual methodologies : an introduction to researching with visual materials,* London, SAGE Publications Ltd.

ROSE, S. 1988. Gender antagonism and class conflict: Exclusionary strategies of male trade unionists in nineteenth-century Britain. *Social History,* 13 (2)**,** 191-208.

ROSENER, J. 1990. Ways Women Lead. *Harvard Business Review,* 68 (6)**,** 119-125.

ROTTENBERG, C. 2014. The Rise of Neoliberal Feminism. *Cultural Studies,* 28 (3)**,** 418-437.

RUBERY, J. 2017. Why is women's work low-paid? Establishing a framework for understanding the causes of low pay among professions traditionally dominated by women. *In:* OXFAM DISCUSSION PAPERS (ed.).

RUBERY, J. 2018. Joan Acker and Doing Comparable Worth. *Gender, Work & Organization,* Special issue**,** doi: 10.1111/gwao.12242.

RUBIN, G. 1975. The Traffic in Women: Notes on the "Political Economy" of Sex. *In:* REITER, R. (ed.) *Toward an anthropology of women.* New York: Monthly Press Review.

RUMENS, N. 2017. Queering lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender identities in human resource development and management education contexts. *Management Learning,* 48 (2)**,** 227-242.

RUMENS, N., DE SOUZA, E. M. & BREWIS, J. 2019. Queering Queer Theory in Management and Organization Studies: Notes toward queering heterosexuality. *Organization Studies,* 40 (4)**,** 593-612.

RUMENS, N. & TYLER, M. 2015. Towards a Queer Politics and Ethics Within Organization Studies. *In:* PULLEN, A. & RHODES, C. (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Ethics, Politics and Organizations.* London: Routledge.

RUMENS, N. & TYLER, M. 2016. Queer theory. *In:* MIR, R., WILLMOTT, H. & GREENWOOD, M. (eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy in Organization Studies.* London and New York: Routledge.

RUTHERFORD, S. 2011. *Women's work, men's cultures : overcoming resistance and changing organizational cultures,* Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.

SAAR, M. 2008. Understanding Genealogy: History, Power and the Self. *Journal of the Philosophy of History,* 2**,** 295-314.

SAINI, A. 2017. *Inferior. How science got women wrong ... and the new research that's rewriting the story,* London, 4th ESTATE.

SALMINEN, J., JUNG, S.-G., SANTOS, J. M. & JANSEN, B. J. 2019. The Effect of Smiling Pictures on Perceptions of Personas. *27th Conference of User Modeling, Adaptation and Personalization Adjunct.* Cyprus.

SANDFORD, S. 2006. *How to read Beauvoir,* London, Granta.

SANZ, V. 2017. No Way Out of the Binary: A Critical History of the Scientific Production of Sex. *Signs,* 43 (1)**,** 1-27.

SCHERER, A. 2009. Critical Theory and its Contribution to Critical Management Studies. *In:* ALVESSON, M., BRIDGMAN, T. & WILLMOTT, H. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

SCHEURICH, J. & MCKENZIE, K. 2005. Foucault's Methodologies: Archaeology and Genealogy. *In:* DENZIN, N. & LINCOLN, Y. (eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Qualititative Research.* Third ed. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.

SCOTT, J. L., CROMPTON, R. & LYONETTE, C. (eds.) 2010. *Gender inequalities in the 21st century : new barriers and continuing constraints,* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

SEALY, R. 2010. Changing perceptions of meritocracy in senior women's careers. *Gender in Management: An International Journal,* 25 (3)**,** 184-197.

SEIERSTAD, C. 2015. Beyond the Business Case: The Need for Both Utility and Justice Rationales for Increasing the Share of Women on Boards. *Corporate Governance: An International Review,* 24 (4)**,** 390-405.

SEIERSTAD, C., WARNER-SØDERHOLM, G., TORCHIA, M. & HUSE, M. 2017. Increasing the Number of Women on Boards: The Role of Actors and Processes. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 141 (2)**,** 289-315.

SHERRATT, Y. 2002. *Adorno's positive dialectic,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

SHERRATT, Y. 2004. Adorno's Concept of the Self: A Marriage of Freud and Hegelian Marxism. *Revue Internationale De Philosophie,* 58 (227 (1))**,** 101-117.

SILVERMAN, D. 2011. *Interpreting qualitative data : a guide to the principles of qualitative research,* London, Sage.

SIMPSON, R. 1998. Presenteeism, Power and Organizational Change: Long Hours as a Career Barrier and the Impact on the Working Lives of Women Managers. *British Journal of Management,* 9 (Special Issue 1)**,** 37-50.

SINGH, V. & POINT, S. 2006. (Re)Presentations of Gender and Ethnicity in Diversity Statements on European Company Websites. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 68 (4)**,** 363-379.

ŚLIWA, M. & JOHANSSON, M. 2014. The discourse of meritocracy contested/reproduced: Foreign women academics in UK business schools. *Organization,* 21 (6)**,** 821-843.

SOMMERLAD, H. 2015. The 'Social Magic' of Merit: Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in the English and Welsh Legal Profession. *Fordham Law Review,* 83 (5)**,** 2325-2348.

SPANGLER, T. 2018. Amazon Spent $107 Million on 'Man in the High Castle' Season 2 (Report). *Variety.*

SPICER, A., ALVESSON, M. & KARREMAN, D. 2016. Extending critical performativity. *Human Relations,* 69 (2)**,** 225-249.

SPICER, A., ALVESSON, M. & KÄRREMAN, D. 2009. Critical performativity: The unfinished business of critical management studies. *Human Relations,* 62 (4)**,** 537-560.

SPRINGBOARD CONSULTANCY. Undated. *Springboard contributes to Royal Mail's continuing success* [Online]. Available: http://www.springboardconsultancy.com/training-case-studies/royal-mail/ [Accessed 13 March 2017].

STANDING, G. 1999. Global Feminisation Through Flexible Labour: A Theme Revisited. *World Development,* 27 (3)**,** 583-602.

STANDING, G. 2011. *The Precariat. The New Dangerous Class,* London, New York, Bloomsbury Academic.

STOCKDALE, E., WILLIAM, L. C. & AREVSHATIAN, L. 2018. "Do I fit in?" Signals on corporate websites. *Human Resource Management International Digest,* 26 (7)**,** 7-11.

STOETZLER, M. 2016. Subject trouble. *Philosophy & Social Criticism,* 31 (3)**,** 343-368.

STOKER, J. I., VAN DER VELDE, M. & LAMMERS, J. 2012. Factors Relating to Managerial Stereotypes: The Role of Gender of the Employee and the Manager and Management Gender Ratio. *Journal of Business and Psychology,* 27 (1)**,** 31-42.

STOLLER, R. J. 1974. *Sex and gender : the development of masculinity and femininity,* London, Karnac Books.

STONE, A. 2004a. Essentialism and Anti-Essentialism in Feminist Philosophy. *Journal of Moral Philosophy,* 1 (2)**,** 135-153.

STONE, A. 2004b. On the Genealogy of Women: A Defence of Anti-Essentialism. *In:* GILLIS, S., HOWIE, G. & MUNFORD, R. (eds.) *Third Wave Feminism* Basingstoke, Hampshire: PALGRAVE MACMILLAN.

STONE, A. 2008. Adorno and logic. *In:* COOK, D. (ed.) *Theodor Adorno: key concepts.* Stocksfield: Acumen.

SWAN, E. 2010. Commodity Diversity: Smiling Faces as a Strategy of Containment. *Organization,* 17 (1)**,** 77-100.

TATLI, A. 2011. A Multi-layered Exploration of the Diversity Management Field: Diversity Discourses, Practices and Practitioners in the UK. *British Journal of Management,* 22 (2)**,** 238-253.

TAYLOR, D. 2015. Children seeking gender identity advice sees 100% increase, says NHS. *The Guardian,*, 5 November.

TEASDALE, N., FAGAN, C. & SHEPHERD, C. 2012. Women's Representation on the Boards of UK-Listed Companies. *In:* FAGAN, C., GONZÁLEZ MENÉNDEZ, M. & GÓMEZ ANSÓN, S. (eds.) *Women on Corporate Boards*

and in Top Management: European Trends and Policy. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

TENORIO, E. 2011. Critical Discourse Analysis, an Overview. *Nordic Journal of English Studies,* 10 (1)**,** 183-210.

TERJESEN, S. & SEALY, R. 2016. Board Gender Quotas: Exploring Ethical Tensions from a Multi-Theoretical Perspective. *Business Ethics Quarterly,* Forthcoming.

TERJESEN, S. & SINGH, V. 2008. Female Presence on Corporate Boards: A Multi-Country Study of Environmental Context. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 83 (1)**,** 55-63.

TESTA, I. 2007. Criticism from within nature. The dialectic between first and second nature from McDowell to Adorno. *Philosophy & Social Criticism,* 33 (4)**,** 473-497.

THANEM, T. & WALLENBERG, L. 2016. Just doing gender? Transvestism and the power of underdoing gender in everyday life and work. *Organization,* 23 (2)**,** 250-271.

THE TAVISTOCK AND PORTMAN NHS FOUNDATION TRUST. 2018. *GIDS referrals increase in 2017/18* [Online]. Available: https://tavistockandportman.nhs.uk/about-us/news/stories/gids-referrals-increase-201718/ [Accessed 25 November 2018].

THOMSON, E. 2009. Do Ends Justify Means? Feminist Perspectives on the Business Case for Equality in the UK Labour Market. *e-cadernos ces [Online]***,** doi: 10.4000/eces.298.

THUN, C. 2019. Excellent and gender equal? Academic motherhood and'gender blindness' in Norwegian academia. *Gender, Work & Organization***,** doi: 10.1111/gwao.12368.

TINKER, T. & NEIMARK, M. 1987. The role of annual reports in gender and class contradictions at general motors: 1917-1976. *Accounting, Organizations and Society,* 12 (1)**,** 71-88.

TOMLINSON, F. & SCHWABENLAND, C. 2009. Reconciling Competing Discourses of Diversity? The UK Non-Profit Sector Between Social Justice and the Business Case. *Organization,* 17 (1)**,** 101-121.

TYLER, M. 2011. Postmodern Feminism and Organization Studies: A Marriage of Inconvenience? *In:* JEANES, E., KNIGHTS, D. & MARTIN, P. (eds.) *Handbook of Gender, Work & Organization.* West Sussex: Wiley & Sons Ltd.

TYLER, M. 2014. Simone de Beauvoir (1908 - 1986). *In:* HELIN, J., HERNES, T., HJORTH, D. & HOLT, R. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Process, Philosophy and Organization Studies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

TYLER, M. 2019. Reassembling difference? Rethinking inclusion through/as embodied ethics. *Human Relations,* 72 (1)**,** 48-68.

UNILEVER. 2016. *A transgender band helped Brooke Bond live its brand purpose* [Online]. Available: https://www.unilever.com/news/news-and-features/Feature-article/2016/a-transgender-band-helped-Brooke-Bond-live-its-brand-purpose.html [Accessed 5 April 2019].

UNILEVER. Undated. *Challenging harmful gender norms* [Online]. Available: https://www.unilever.com/sustainable-living/enhancing-livelihoods/opportunities-for-women/Challenging-harmful-gender-norms/index.html [Accessed 5 April 2019].

UNILEVER PLC. 2017. *Unilever urges world leaders to unstereotype the workplace* [Online]. Available: https://www.unilever.com/news/news-and-

features/2017/Unilever-urges-world-leaders-to-unstereotype-the-workplace.html [Accessed 5 March 2017].

UNILEVER PLC. Undated. *Persil* [Online]. Available: https://www.unilever.co.uk/brands/our-brands/persil.html [Accessed 5 March 2017].

URWIN, P., PARRY, E., DODDS, I., KARUK, V. & DAVID, A. 2013. The Business Case for Equality and Diversity. A survey of the academic literature. *In:* DEPARTMENT FOR BUSINESS, I. A. S. (ed.) *BIS Occasional Paper No 4.*

VANDERMASSEN, G. 2005. *Who's afraid of Charles Darwin? Debating feminism and evolutionary theory,* Lanham, MD, Rowman & Littlefield.

VILLIERS, C. 2010. Achieving gender balance in the boardroom: is it time for legislative action in the UK? *Legal Studies,* 30 (4)**,** 533-557.

VINNICOMBE, S. 1987. What Exactly Are the Differences in Male and Female Working Styles? *Women in Management Review,* 3 (1)**,** 13-21.

VIRGIN MONEY & HM TREASURY 2016. Empowering Productivity. Harnessing the Talents of Women in Financial Services.

VISSER, M. 2019. Pragmatism, Critical Theory and Business Ethics: Converging Lines. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 156 (1)**,** 45-57.

WALBY, S. (ed.) 1988. *Gender segregation at work,* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

WALBY, S. 1990. *Theorizing patriarchy,* Oxford, Blackwell.

WALKER, L. 2019. *How to Edit Gender Identity Status on Facebook. Many Options Besides Male and Female* [Online]. Lifewire. Available: https://www.lifewire.com/edit-gender-identity-status-on-facebook-2654421 [Accessed 21 July 2019].

WEST, C. & ZIMMERMAN, D. 1987. Doing Gender. *Gender and Society,* 1 (2)**,** 125-151.

WESTBROOK, L. & SCHILT, K. 2014. Doing Gender, Determining Gender:: Transgender People, Gender Panics, and the Maintenance of the Sex/Gender/Sexuality System. *Gender & Society,* 28 (1)**,** 32-57.

WHARTON, A. 1991. Structure and Agency in Socialist-Feminist Theory. *Gender & Society,* 5 (3)**,** 373-389.

WHITBREAD PLC 2013. Equal Opportunities Policy.

WHITBREAD PLC 2018. Gender pay and bonus gap report.

WHITE, R. & HANSON, D. 2002. Economic man and disciplinary boundaries. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal,* 15 (4)**,** 450-477.

WHYMAN, T. 2016. Understanding Adorno on 'Natural-History'. *International Journal of Philosophical Studies,* 24 (4)**,** 452-472.

WILLE, B., WIERNIK, B., VERGAUWE, J., VRIJDAGS, A. & TRBOVIC, N. 2018. Personality characteristics of male and female executives: Distinct pathways to success? *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 106 (June)**,** 220-235.

WILSON, F. M. 2003. *Organizational behaviour and gender,* Aldershot, Ashgate.

WITTIG, M. 1983. The Point of View: Universal or Particular. *Feminist Issues,* Fall**,** 63-69.

WITTIG, M. 1985. The Mark of Gender. *Feminist Issues,* 5 (2)**,** 3-12.

WITTIG, M. 1993. One is Not Born a Woman. *In:* ABELOVE, H., BARALE, M. & HALPERIN, D. (eds.) *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader.* London: Routledge.

WITZ, A. 1992. Professions and patriarchy Oxford: Blackwell.

WODAK, R. & MEYER, M. (eds.) 2016. *Methods of critical discourse studies,* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications Ltd.

WODAK, R. & MEYER, R. 2009. Critical discourse analysis: history, agenda, theory and methodology. *In:* WODAK, R. & MEYER, M. (eds.) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.* Los Angeles, London, New Delhi: Sage.

YOUNG, I. M. 2002. Lived Body vs Gender: Reflections on Social Structure and Subjectivity. *Ratio,* 15 (4)**,** 410-428.

YUN LEE, L. 2005. *Dialectics of the Body. Corporeality in the Philosophy of T.W. Adorno,* New York & London, Routledge.

YUN LEE, L. 2006. The Bared-Breasts Incident. *In:* HEBERLE, R. (ed.) *Feminist Interpretations of Theodor Adorno.* Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press.

ZANONI, P. & JANSSENS, M. 2004. Deconstructing difference: The rhetoric of human resource managers' diversity discourses. *Organization Studies,* 25 (1)**,** 55-74.

ZANONI, P. & JANSSENS, M. 2015. The Power of Diversity Discourses at Work: On the Interlocking Nature of Diversities and Occupations. *Organization Studies,* 36 (11)**,** 1463-1483.

ZANONI, P., JANSSENS, M., BENSCHOP, Y. & NKOMO, S. 2010. Guest Editorial: Unpacking Diversity, Grasping Inequality: Rethinking Difference Through Critical Perspectives. *Organization,* 17 (1)**,** 9-29.

ZIEGE, E.-M. 2003. The Fetish-Character of "Woman": On a Letter From Theodor W. Adorno to Erich Fromm. *Logos,* 2 (4).

ZUIDERVAART, L. 1992. Contra-diction. Adorno's Philosophy of Discourse. *In:* SILLS, C. & JENSEN, G. (eds.) *The Philosophy of Discourse: The Rhetorical Turn in Twentieth-Century Thought.* Portsmouth NH: Heinemaan.